



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (BA) NO. 1013/2025

Rohidas Birsing Banjar Vs. State of Maharashtra

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. R. U. Tambe, Advocate (Appointed) for the Applicant.

Mr. C. A. Lokhande, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 30/09/2025.

. Heard.

2. The applicant is arrested in Crime No.44/2024 registered at Police Station Korchi, District Gadchiroli for the offence punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. It is alleged that in the night intervening between 28.05.2024 and 29.05.2024, the applicant along with his wife/deceased and his daughter Vaishali, who is eight years of age were sleeping in the house. At night the quarrel took place between the applicant and his wife/the deceased. The allegations are made that the applicant has committed the murder of his wife by assaulting on her neck with the axe. The daughter has informed about it to her grandmother, thereafter, the relatives came there. The daughter has informed about the assault by her father on the neck of her mother and thereafter, the crime is registered. Thereafter, the applicant was arrested.

4. The learned Counsel for the applicant has stated that at the time of incident, the applicant was not present in the house. When people gathered there, the applicant came from outside and then, the relatives caught

him, and he was arrested. He has not committed any offence. The applicant is in jail from 29.05.2024. Hence, prayed to release him on bail.

5. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that, the postmortem report shows that the deceased died due to cut injury to her neck. Eye witness is there. The daughter of the deceased has narrated about the incident and the applicant is arrested. If the applicant is released on bail, there is every possibility of tampering of witnesses. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard both the learned Counsel for the respective parties.

7. The eye witness is the daughter of the deceased. On her statement, the offence is disclosed. The recovery of axe is at the instance of this accused/applicant. Considering the nature of the offence, this is not a fit case to release the applicant on bail. Hence, the application is rejected.

8. The fees of the learned Counsel appointed for the applicant be quantified as per Rules.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)