

MHAH010046252026



Cri.Bail Application No.1406/2026

Ravindra Popat Ghule

Vs.

State of Maharashtra

ORDER BELOW EXH-1

By way of this application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant/accused Ravindra Popat Ghule, seeks his enlargement on bail.

(A) CASE DETAILS

FIR Number & Date	:	720/2026 dated 11.06.2026
Police Station, District and State	:	Pathardi Police Station, Tal. Pathardi, Dist. Ahilyanagar, (Maharashtra)
Sections invoked	:	87, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023
Maximum punishment prescribed	:	Upto 10 years

(B) CUSTODY & PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE

Date of Arrest	:	15.06.2026
Total period of custody	:	As on today 43 days.

(C) STATUS OF TRIAL

Stage of proceedings (Investigation/charge-sheet/cognizance/framing of chargers/Trial)	:	Charge-sheet, Pending
Total number of witnesses cited in the charge-sheet	:	11.
Number of prosecution witnesses examined	:	No.

(D) CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS

FIR No. and Police Station	:	C.R.No.86/2019, Pathardi P. S.
Sections	:	394 of IPC.

Status (Pending/ Acquitted/ Convicted)	: Pending.
FIR No. and Police Station	: C.R.No.444/2019, Pathardi P S.
Sections	: 379 of IPC.
Status (Pending/ Acquitted/ Convicted)	: Pending.
FIR No. and Police Station	: C.R.No.304/2023, Pathardi P S.
Sections	: 324, 323, 504, 506, 143, 147, 149 of IPC.
Status (Pending/ Acquitted/ Convicted)	: Pending.

(E) PREVIOUS BAIL APPLICATIONS

Court	: District & Sessions Court, A'nagar
Case No.	: Bail Apln. No.1060/2026
Outcome of case	: Rejected.

(F) COERCIVE PROCESSES

Whether any Non Bailable warrant was issued	: No.
Whether declared a proclaimed offender	: No.

2. It is the case of prosecution that daughter of the informant is a student. The applicant gave a proposal to the informant to marry his daughter with his son. Informant refused the proposal as son of the applicant was a minor. So son of the applicant told the informant that if the informant will not allow for the marriage, he will kidnapped his daughter. On 08/05/2026 at about 06:30 a.m.. The informant received the phone call from grandmother of the victim, where the victim was staying that the victim is not being found. So missing complaint was filed. The informant received information that son of the applicant is also missing and he has kidnapped the

victim with the help of his father and other co-accused. Applicant demanded amount of Rs.30,000/- for giving information of victim which was paid by the informant through the PhonePe to the applicant. On 06/06/2026 when informant went behind the applicant and other co-accused he found that they went to Nashik and gave amount to son of the applicant. When informant questioned them about the victim, he was told that after son of the applicant becomes major, they will be married. Thereafter, the informant was abused and assaulted by the applicant and co-accused.

3. Ld. Advocate for the applicant/accused submitted that the victim is a major. Charge-sheet is filed. There is no documentary evidence on record by the prosecution to prove that the applicant received Rs.30,000/- from the informant. There is a delay in FIR. Applicant is ready to abide by any conditions of the court and co-operate with the investigating agency. It is also submitted that bail cannot be refused on the ground that the offence is grave and serious and several criminal cases are pending against the accused. Reliance is placed on *Prabhakar Tiwari Vs. State of U.P. and Anr., Supreme Court, 2020 CLU 637*.

4. The learned APP filed his say and strongly opposed the application. He has submitted that the nature of offence is serious. Amount of Rs.30,000/- is not returned. Applicant is a habitual offender. If applicant is released, he will pressurize the informant and the witnesses.

5. Heard parties. Perused FIR, say and documents filed on record. The papers show seriousness of the crime and involvement of the applicant in the alleged crime. It was submitted by the informant that there is threat to the life of the victim so complaint is lodged accordingly. Papers on record show that applicant has sought an amount of Rs.30,000/- for furnishing the whereabouts of the victim to the informant. The applicant though has contended that no evidence regarding the same is led, according to the prosecution it is a mater of trial. It is put on record that victim is a student and was appearing for NEET examinations. The prosecution apprehends that release of accused on bail is likely to aggravate the existing dispute between the parties, creating the possibility of further offences against human body, including homicide, thereby disturbing public peace, law and order.

6. Considering the gravity of offence, the other facts on record and especially the apprehension of the informant regarding threat to life of his daughter (victim) it will not be proper to release this applicant on bail. The facts in *Prabhakar Tiwari (supra)* and the facts in this case are different to each other, so ratio of the same cannot be applicable to the present facts. The application therefore, deserves to be rejected. Hence, the order-

ORDER

Application stands rejected.

Date : 13/08/2026
Place : Ahmednagar.

(**M.S.Bhadane**)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Ahmednagar. J O Code-MH00417