

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, PUNE.

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO.3473/2026

Suraj Sonu Pawar

Age 32 Years, Occu: Painter,
R/at. Sainagar, Kihim,
Dist. Raigad.

Applicant/Accused.

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra

Through Fursungi police station
Crime No. 188/2026

Respondent.

CORAM : H. M. BHOSALE

ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-12, PUNE

DATE : 22/07/2026

This is an application taken out by the applicant/accused **Suraj Sonu Pawar** seeking bail under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “**BNSS**”) in connection with Crime No. 188 of 2026 registered with Fursungi Police Station, Pune for the offences under sections 69, 351(2) and 352 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 [For short ‘**BNS**’].

Brief Facts :-

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the prosecutrix got married with one Vivek Parbatrao. She blessed with one boy namely Shlok. Thereafter, the prosecutrix took divorce prior to eight months of this incident. Thereafter, she had uploaded her bio-data on

Jeevansathi.com for second marriage. She came in contact with the applicant/accused. They expressed desire to perform the marriage. Thereafter, they started conversation through social Apps like WhatsApp and Instagram.

3. It is the further case of the prosecution that on 06/05/2026, around 11.30 p.m., the applicant/accused went to the house of the prosecutrix to discuss about the marriage. They have decided the date of marriage as 10/06/2026. The marriage was to be performed at Alandi. Thereafter, on 07/05/2026, the applicant/accused went to the house of the prosecutrix at 12.15 a.m. and had physical relations against her wish. The prosecutrix convinced the applicant/accused to have physical relations only after the marriage but the applicant/accused did not pay any heed and assured her that within a short span they would be husband and wife. After physical relations, the applicant/accused informed the prosecutrix that his friend is at “Satkar” Lodge at Handewadi and he will meet him and return within ten minutes. Thereafter, he did not return. The prosecutrix sent message to him but his phone was switched off. Therefore, in the morning she went to “Satkar” Lodge. She found the applicant/accused alongwith his wife in room no. 201. Therefore, it is alleged that the applicant/accused committed rape on the prosecutrix by giving false promise of the marriage.

4. The bail is sought mainly on the grounds that the prosecutrix is major and capable to understand the consequences. The applicant/accused has roots in the society. He is ready to abide all the terms and conditions. The material investigation is over. He is sole breadwinner in the family. Therefore, he may be released on bail.

5. The learned APP and the investigation officer vide say resisted the application on the ground that the offence is serious in nature. The applicant/accused has maintained physical relations by giving false promise of marriage. There is possibility to pressurize the prosecutrix and the witnesses. Therefore, the bail application may be rejected.

6. Heard Mr. Pawar, the learned advocate for the applicant/accused and Mr. Khan, the learned APP for the State at length.

7. Mr. Pawar, the learned advocate for the applicant/accused submitted that this is a totally false case lodged by the prosecutrix. She had lodged identical FIR against one Ajinkya Jadhav, Police Officer. She had blackmailed Mr. Ajinkya Jadhav. The Sessions Court vide order dated 17/10/2025, granted pre-arrest bail to Mr. Ajinkya Jadhav with specific observations that entire allegations are false. He further submitted that the *modus operandi* of the prosecutrix is like a honey trap cases. She deceived several persons by adopting this *modus*

operandi. He further submitted that the charge-sheet is filed. The investigation is over. Therefore, the applicant/accused may be released on bail.

8. The learned APP submitted that considering seriousness of the offence, the bail application may be rejected.

9. The points arise for determination alongwith findings and reasons thereon are as under:

Sr. Nos.	Points	Findings
1.	Whether the applicant/accused is entitled for bail ?	Yes
2.	What Order ?	Application is allowed.

REASONS

As to point No.1 :-

10. I have evaluated the facts of the case carefully and with meticulous precision, particularly, the allegations which have been directly attributed to the applicant/accused.

11. The First Information Report [For short “FIR”] reveals that on 07/05/2026 the applicant/accused went to the house of the

prosecutrix at 12.15 a.m. i.e. at midnight. He had physical relations with the prosecutrix and thereafter, returned to “Satkar” Lodge by giving a false reason that his friend is waiting in the said lodge. Thereafter, on next day morning, the prosecutrix visited the said lodge and found the applicant/accused alongwith his wife in room no. 201.

12. After a bare glance of these accusations, the same appears quite suspicious and unreliable. I am saying so, because it is quite difficult to believe that the applicant/accused, who had booked a room in lodge for himself and his wife, will dare to come in the house of the prosecutrix for sometime only for the purpose of physical relations. It is quite difficult to accept that any husband will take such type of risk by making his wife to stay in the lodge alone. The distance between the house of the prosecutrix and the lodge is also considerable.

13. Mr. Pawar, the learned advocate for the applicant/accused also placed on record WhatsApp chat in between the prosecutrix and the applicant/accused dated 06/05/2026. It is significant to note that the prosecutrix is literally begging and inviting the applicant/accused to her house. She specifically mentioned in the message that the applicant/accused shall meet her once. She also stated her inability to perform the marriage with the applicant/accused and tendered apology for the same. If this is situation, then it is quite difficult to believe the averments in the FIR that on 06/05/2026, she alongwith the applicant/accused met at her house at 11.30 p.m. and decided the date

of marriage as 10/06/2026. These material facts prima facie creates substantial doubt about the genuineness in the accusations.

14. Moving ahead, Mr. Pawar, the learned advocate for the applicant/accused has placed on record FIR dated 27/09/2025 lodged by the same prosecutrix against one Ajinkya Jadhav, Police Officer, making identical accusations that he has also committed rape on her by giving false promise of marriage. The Sessions Court while granting pre-arrest bail to Mr. Ajinkya Jadhav categorically observed the relations in between them were consensual. There was exchange of money. They were in love.

15. Mr. Pawar also placed on record complaint dated 01/09/2025 lodged by Ajinkya Jadhav against the prosecutrix with police, wherein he has specifically alleged that this prosecutrix involved him in honey trap and extorted money from time to time. He also made allegations that this prosecutrix demanded Rs. 10 lakhs and threatened that otherwise, she will lodge false report for committing rape. This complaint was lodged by Ajinkya Jadhav on 01/09/2025 and this prosecutrix lodged report against him on 27/09/2025. This factual position speaks in volume.

16. Mr. Pawar has placed reliance on the judgment in the case of **Amrit Pal Singh V/s. State of Rajasthan [2021 Supreme (Raj) 1101]**, wherein, the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to enlarge the accused on

bail by observing that the prosecutrix is in a habit of lodging cases by involving persons in honey trap. In the given case also, some cases were produced before the court showing that the prosecutrix was involved in lodging of honey trap cases.

17. To my mind, the aforesaid observations are squarely applicable in the present set of facts. The *modus operandi*, which transpires in the case in hand prima facie demonstrates that the prosecutrix is lodging identical cases.

18. After analysis of this entire factual position placed on record by the learned advocate for the applicant/accused, it prima facie creates substantial doubt about the genuineness in the accusations. Thus, I find it difficult to accept at this stage that the applicant/accused is guilty of rape.

19. The investigation is over. The applicant/accused is behind bars from last one month. There is no possibility to commence the trial in immediate future. The applicant/accused has roots in the society. As far as apprehension that he will tamper with prosecution witnesses, imposition of an appropriate conditions will serve the purpose. It is needless to state that in case of breach of terms and conditions, it is always open for the prosecution to move for cancellation of bail.

20. It is hereby made it clear all the aforesaid observations are not on merit and shall be construed to the extent of adjudication of this bail application. In turn, I answer point No.1 in the affirmative and pass the following order to answer point No.2.

ORDER

1.	The Bail Application No. 3473/2026 is allowed in the following terms:-
2.	The applicant/accused Suraj Sonu Pawar shall be released on bail in connection with Crime No. 188/2026 registered with Fursungi police station for the offences punishable under sections 69, 351(2) and 352 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhaita, on executing personal bond of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousands only) with one or two sureties in the like amount.
	a] The applicant/accused shall provide his present mobile number alongwith his address. He shall submit document in support of his address. In addition to this, the applicant / accused shall submit names alongwith complete address and phone number of his two blood relatives. This information shall be submitted to the investigation officer as well as this court.
	b] The applicant / accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing the such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

	c] The applicant / accused shall not commit similar offence after release on bail.
	d] The applicant / accused shall attend the trial on scheduled dates.
	e] Any infraction of aforesaid conditions would entail into cancellation of bail.

Date:- 22.07.2026
Pune.

(H. M. Bhosale)
Additional Sessions Judge-12,
Pune.

CERTIFICATE

“ I affirm that the contents of the P. D.F. File order are same word for word as per original order.

Name of Steno	- Mrs. P P Deo (Stenographer Grade-I)
Court Name	- Shri. H. M. Bhosale, Additional Sessions Judge-12, Pune.
Date of Order	- 22/07/2026
Dictated and typed on computer	- 22/07/2026
Checked & Signed On	- 22/07/2026
Uploaded on	- 22/07/2026