

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
AKOLA.**

MHAK010020742026



Cri. Bail Appln. No. 463/2026.

**Sakshi Sunil Dhoke,
R/o. Ramabai Nagar, Malkapur,
Akola**

Vs.

**State of Maharashtra
through P.S. Khadan, Akola**

ORDER BELOW EXH.1.

(Dated 10.06.2026)

<u>Case Details.</u>		
FIR Number and Date	:	1058/2026 Dated 17.05.2026
Police Station, District & State	:	Khadan, Akola, Tq & Dist. Akola
Sections invoked	:	351(2), 352, 64, 69, 77, 78(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
Maximum punishment prescribed	:	Imprisonment Upto 10 Years and Fine.
<u>Custody and Procedural Compliance.</u>		
Date of Arrest	:	NA
Total Period of custody undergone	:	NA

<u>Status of Trial.</u>		
State of Proceedings	:	Investigation is in progress.
Total number of witnesses cited in charge sheet	:	Chargesheet yet to be filed.
Number of prosecution witnesses examined	:	Nil.
<u>Criminal Antecedents.</u>		
F.I.R. No.	:	Nil
Sections	:	Nil
Status	:	Nil
<u>Previous Bail Applications.</u>		
Court	:	None
Case No.	:	None
Outcome of the case	:	None
<u>Coercive Procedures.</u>		
Whether any non bailable warrant was issued?	:	No.
Whether declared a proclaimed offender?	:	No.

Perused the application and say filed by learned APP and I.O. vide Exh. 8 so also the objection filed by objector vide Exh. 9. Heard both learned counsels.

2) Applicant has filed the present application for grant of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for applicant argued that on the basis of false report lodged by informant offence punishable under Sections 351(2), 352, 64, 69, 77, 78(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 came to be registered with P.S. Khadan against one Nitin Dandi and present applicant vide crime No. 1058/2026. In fact, applicant has no concern with the informant. Whatever allegations are made in FIR, those are against accused No. 1 Nitin. He threatened informant to viral the video and present applicant has no role in it. On the contrary, present applicant had lodged report on 02.12.2024 against objector. Nothing remained to be investigated. Mobile phone is already seized. There is no necessity of custodial interrogation. The offence alleged are also not punishable with life or death. Hence, applicant is entitled to anticipatory bail.

3) He also placed his reliance on the following authority.

1. **Siddharam Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others**, 2010 CJ (SC) 2301.

2. **Ashokkumar Vs. State of Union Territory Chandigarh**, 2024 CJ (SC) 121 and on the basis of the same he submitted that application be allowed.

4) Per contra, learned APP for State argued that investigation is in progress. As mobile phone used in the crime is in possession of accused and the same is yet to be seized,

therefore custodial interrogation of accused is necessary. Hence application be rejected.

5) Having regard to the submissions made by learned both counsels so also the objection petition Exh. 9 filed by victim, I found that whatever serious allegations are there, those are against accused No. 1 Nikhil Babarao Dandi. From case diary so also the objection petition it is prima facie clear that present applicant Sakshi is alleged to be the wedded wife of accused Nikhil who threatened victim to viral her videos. From Exh. 9 itself it is prima facie clear that victim has grievance against accused Nikhil only. As being wife, applicant asked the victim about her relation with her husband on that victim get annoyed and resultantly applicant also came to be implicated in the said crime.

6) Therefore, considering the material on record particularly objection petition and case diary, it is clear that no custodial interrogation of applicant is warranted. Moreover, the mobile phone used in the crime appears to be seized from Nikhil. Apart from this, the offences levelled against present applicant are not punishable with imprisonment upto 7 years. Though offence under Section 64 and 69 is also registered against present applicant, still so far as present applicant is concerned, the same is not applicable and made out. Therefore, in view of the same certainly petitioner is entitled for protection from the arrest. Therefore, application deserves to be allowed. Hence the following order.

ORDER

1. Application is allowed.
2. In the event of arrest of applicant Sakshi Sunil Dhoke in Crime No. 1058/2026 registered with Police Station Khadan for the offence punishable under Section 351(2), 352, 64, 69, 77 and 78(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 PSO Khadan is directed to release the applicant on executing PB of Rs. 25,000/-.
3. The applicant shall co-operate the investigating agency and shall attend police station Khadan as and when required by the investigating officer.
4. Inform PSO Khadan accordingly.

Akola
Date:- 10.06.2026

(P. B. Naikwad)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Akola