

ORDER BELOW EXH-1 IN CRI. BAIL APPLICATION NO. 66/2026.

MHAH130001642026
(Sumit Lajras Kharat Vs. State)

1. This application is filed u/s 482 BNSS, for Anticipatory Bail, in Crime no.117/2026 of Newasa Police Station.
2. Sachin Dashrath Chandane committed suicide by hanging himself, on 15.02.2026, in the evening, in his house.
3. On 16.02.2026, Crime no. 117/2026 came to be registered in Newasa Police Station for offences under section 108, 352, 351 of BNS against (1) Manisha wife of Sachin Chandane and (2) Sumit Lajras Kharat; on the basis of report lodged by Lahanubai Dashrath Chandane. Lahanubai is mother of deceased Sachin. Accused no.1 Manisha is wife of deceased Sachin.
4. It is stated in the FIR that, deceased Sachin had married with accused Manisha prior to 12 years. They are blessed with one son and one daughter.
5. It are allegations in the FIR that, on 15.01.2026, along with her brother Mahesh Santosh Shinde, accused Manisha had gone to her parental home. Present applicant / accused Sumit Kharat resides adjacent to her parental home. On that occasion, accused Manisha had gone with accused Sumit Kharat for five days.

6. Thereafter, on 31.01.2026, Manisha left matrimonial home with her son. Sachin had given a report in police station that Manisha was missing. Accused Manisha and accused Sumit Kharat had talked on phone with Sachin. In that talk accused Sumit Kharat not only insulted but hurled threats also.

7. Thereafter, it is stated in FIR that, accused Manisha and accused Sumit, had made calls to Sachin for several times, abused him and threatened him.

8. Learned Advocate for accused Sumit argued that, Sachin committed suicide on 15.02.2026 but report was lodged on 16.02.2026. There is delay of one day. He submitted that accused Sumit is falsely roped in this crime on previous animosity. He submitted that presence of accused Sumit is not necessary before IO, for any recovery or for another purpose.

9. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor brought my attention to one application/complaint dated 11.03.2026 that was made by present informant Lahanubai in the police station.

10. A husband may have option to seek divorce if wife is living in adultery. However, from the contents in the FIR, it is seen that, there are certain instances, that would attract offence of abetment. Acts of accused of making phone calls, using taunts, giving threats would amount to abetment. Only living in adultery would not be of concern. However, if, threats are given, then it would increase gravity of the offence. Here, in this case, it are allegations that accused Manisha and accused Sumit had snapped their obscene photos to show to Sachin. .

11. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that presence of accused Sumit is necessary before IO for seizure of his mobile phone.

12. IO has filed his say. IO has opposed this application mainly on the ground that accused Sumit may influence prosecution witnesses.

13. Custodial interrogation of accused Sumit will be necessary. Offence under section 108 BNS is serious. It will not be proper to grant him anticipatory bail, in such serious offence. Rather, granting anticipatory bail, may frustrate investigation. Hence, this application is rejected.

Date :30.03.2026

Place : Newasa

(R.R.Hastekar)

Addl. Sessions Judge, Newasa