



**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. OF 2026
(@ SLP (Criminal) No. 15334 of 2025)**

HERO ... APPELLANT(S)

VS.

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA ... RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

- 1. Application for intervention is allowed.**
- 2. Leave granted.**
- 3. The appellant who was arraigned as accused in the FIR No. 120 of 2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 143, 144, 147, 148 and 120-B read with 149 of the IPC, Sections 3/25, 5/25 and 27 of the Indian**

Arms Act and under Sections 37(1)(3) and 135 of the Bombay Police Act, 1951, is seeking grant of regular bail. The case of the prosecution is that on 22.02.2024 at about 9 p.m. the complainant who is the brother of Rohit Tiwari @ Golu (deceased) was informed by the acquaintances Ajay Patle and Anmol Sawarkar that his brother Golu Tiwari had been shot by Bunty Dawane and he had collapsed in front of Shalimar Hotel and immediately rushed to Sahayog Hospital where deceased had been taken and it was found that deceased Golu Tiwari had an injury near his eye and on head including injuries on back. It was alleged that Ajay Patle and Anmol Sawarkar had revealed that when they were standing in front of district bank they saw the deceased coming on a motorcycle and was being followed by two other motorcyclists. One of the motorcycle was being driven by the appellant-Hero Dawane and Bunty Dawane was pillion rider. In another motorcycle the co-accused Mohit along with other

associates came behind the deceased and at that time Bunty and Hero Dawane told Golu to run quickly and Bunty fired a bullet which hit Golu Tiwari and as such he expired due to hemorrhagic shock due to fire arm injury sustained and immediately thereafter the accused persons are said to have left the scene of the occurrence. The records would also indicate that Satish Sen confessed that he had shot and killed the deceased with the fire arm. On account of other co-accused having joined the prime accused, they have been roped in as accused for the offences punishable above referred to.

4. Having heard the learned counsels appearing for the parties and taking note of the earlier record of proceedings where this Court had adjourned the matter from time to time to enable the prosecution to complete the evidence of eye-witnesses which was at crucial stage and today the learned counsel appearing for the State would submit that one of the eyewitness

has been examined and he has turned hostile. In the light of the said statement made and the fact that appellant herein is alleged to have been driving the vehicle carrying Buntly Dawane, we are of the considered view that appellant is entitled for being released on bail. Hence, the appeal is allowed, impugned order is set aside and appellant is ordered to be released on bail on such terms and conditions as the jurisdictional Sessions Court may impose.

.....J.
[ARAVIND KUMAR]

.....J.
[PRASANNA B. VARALE]

NEW DELHI;
MAY 18, 2026

ITEM NO.5

COURT NO.13

SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 15334/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 24-04-2025
in CRABA No. 235/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at
Bombay at Nagpur]

HERO

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Respondent(s)

IA No. 229758/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
JUDGMENT

IA No. 229760/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 82825/2026 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION

IA No. 235981/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 18-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARAVIND KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Pratik R. Bombarde, AOR
Mr. Devendra Singh, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Bansal, Adv.
Mr. Subhash Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR
Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.
Mr. Shrirang B. Varma, Adv.
Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.
Mr. Bharat Singh, Adv.
Ms. Chitransha Singh Sikarwar, Adv.

Mr. Rajat Joseph, AOR
Mr. Arjun Vinod Bobde, Adv.

Ms. Shubhangi Jadhao, Adv.
Ms. Avinash Kaur, Adv.
Ms. Tanshi Bharti, Adv.
Ms. Tamanna Awasthi, Adv.
Ms. Akriti Raj, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Application for intervention is allowed.
2. Leave granted.
3. The Appeal is allowed in terms of the Signed Order.
4. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(KAPIL TANDON)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(AVGV RAMU)
COURT MASTER (NSH)

(Signed Order is placed on the file)