

MHBI010042472025



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, BEED, DIST. BEED.

Sessions Case No. 189/2025

State

Vs

Vrundavani Satish Fartare

ORDER BELOW EXH. No. 5

A) CASE DETAILS	
FIR Number & Date	439/2025 Dt. 21/08/2025
Police Station, District and State	Shivaji nagar, Beed, Dist. Beed. Maharashtra State.
Sections invoked	Sec. 103, 238, 3(5) of BNS
Maximum punishment prescribed	Life imprisonment.
[B] CUSTODY & PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE	
Date of Arrest	22/08/2025
Total Period of custody undergone	07 months 18 days.
[C] STATUS OF TRIAL	
Stage of proceeding [Investigation/ Chargesheet / cognizance / Framing of Charges / Trial]	Charge

(2)

Total number of witnesses cited in the chargesheet	26
Number of prosecution witnesses examined	-
[D] CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS	
FIR No. & Police Station	---
Sections	----
Status [Pending / Acquitted Convicted]	---
[E] PREVIOUS BAIL APPLICATIONS	
Court	--
Case No.	---
Outcome of case	---
[F] COERCIVE PROCESSES	
Whether any Non-Bailable Warrant was issued	-
Whether declared a proclaimed offender	-

Accused is being prosecuted by Police Station, Shivaji Nagar, Beed, in Crime No. 439/2025 for the offence punishable u/sec. 103, 238, 3(5) of BNS 2023.

2. As per case of prosecution, deceased was widow and was staying at Beed and she was working as Home Guard. On 20/08/2025 at around 1.00 to 1.30 p.m. informant received call from one Ashvini Sangle room-mate of deceased who told him that, deceased had not returned to room since two days and whether she had come to their village. Informant declined and called his cousin brother Yogesh Murnar who was staying at Beed. He searched

deceased. She was not traced out. Hence, on 20/08/2025 he filed missing complaint at 10.44 p.m. On next day i.e. on 21/08/2025 informant came to know that, deceased was an hindrance in illicit relations of accused with some person, hence accused called deceased to her house and administered her poison forcibly with the help of minor son disposed off the body. Hence he fled complaint against the accused.

3. After crime was registered, accused was arrested. Spot panchnama was done. Inquest panchnama was performed. Body was referred for postmortem examination. As per postmortem notes, deceased due to unknown poison. The clothes of deceased and accused were seized. They were sent to Forensic examination. Scooty used in crime was also seized. I.O recoded statement of witnesses and after completing investigation filed charge-sheet before Court.

4. Ld. counsel Shri. S.S. Sawant for accused submitted that, as per postmortem notes, deceased died due to unknown poisoning and poison was administered at the house of accused. It was further submitted that, accused was staying on first floor. There are other 2 tenants staying nearby and landlord was staying on the ground floor. It was highly improbable that, a young deceased who was serving as Home Guard was forcefully administered poison by the accused and nobody heard voice. It was also argued that, no external injuries were found on the person of deceased and accused. The case of prosecution is improbable and against natural conduct. It is also not disclosed with whom

(4)

accused was having illicit relations. CCTV footage were not collected. CDR are not obtained and it was lastly submitted that, accused is having 03 children and dependent upon her and prayed to grant bail to accused by imposing conditions.

5. Ld. APP Shri. B.S. Rakh for State submitted that, dead body of deceased was traced on the information given by accused as mentioned in the spot panchnama. Bottle of poison was seized as per memorandum statement of accused. Box in which body was transported was also found on the spot. Last location of deceased was at the house of accused. It was submitted that, there is strong circumstantial evidence against accused and it was prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard Ld. counsel Shri. S.S. Sawant for accused and Ld. APP Shri. B.S. Rakh for State. Perused the material on record.

7. Admittedly accused and deceased are acquainted with each other. The deceased was 26 years old widow. She was working as Home Guard and was staying at Beed in a rented room with Ashvini Sangle, who informed to brother of deceased Dnyaneshwar Varkate on 20/08/2025 that, deceased had not returned to their room since last two days. He asked his cousin brother Yogesh Murnar to inquire about deceased. He searched for deceased, could not find her. Hence missing complaint No.457/2025 was registered on 20/08/2025 at 10.44 p.m. Immediately, thereafter, on 22/08/2025 at 1.25 hours accused was arrested. Spot panchnama was done on 21/08/2025 from 4.10 p.m. to 7.10 p.m prior to registration of the crime. It is mentioned in panchnama that, body of deceased was disclosed on the

discloser made by the accused alongwith box which was found near the spot and was used to transport body. Thereafter the crime was registered. Admittedly, this is not discovery under section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act.

8. The deceased was staying with Ashvini Sangle. As per prosecution case, accused was called deceased on 19/08/2025 at around 10.30 a.m. but there is no evidence who had seen deceased going to the house of accused. As per statement of Archana Kamble who is landlady, had deposed in her statement that, she is staying on the ground floor and 03 tenants including accused were staying on top floor. As per prosecution, accused who is shown to be 34 years of age had alone administered poison to deceased who was 26 years of age and young. If a person is administered, as in the case in hand, there has to be resistance from the deceased and some shout for help or loud talk. Also due to resistance there has to be some external injuries. Admittedly no external injuries were found on the body of deceased nor accused, who was immediately arrested after registration of crime. Also there are not statement of witnesses who have deposed that, they had heard any sound coming from the house of accused.

9. Admittedly phone of deceased was not traced during investigation. There are no witnesses to show that, deceased came to the house of accused and there are no witnesses who saw that, accused alongwith her minor son carrying the dead body of deceased in a cartoon box on scooty. Further, no CDR are

(6)

collected in this case to show that, on the day of incident, accused and deceased were in touch with each other.

10. In these circumstances, Court is of the opinion that, as investigation has been completed. Charge-sheet has been filed. Considering the material on record and also taking into account that, accused has 03 minor children and also considering that, accused is having immovable property and there is no likelihood of her absconding, I accordingly allow the application and pass the following order;

ORDER

- 1] Application Exh.5 is allowed.
- 2] Applicant/accused Vrundavani Satish Faratre be released on bail in Crime No. 439/2025, U/sec. 103, 238, 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023, registered with Police Station Shivaji Nagar, Beed, on furnishing PB of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties each of like amount.
- 3] Applicant/accused is directed to submit her residential address alongwith her phone number and phone number of two relatives.
- 4] If there is any change in address and phone number, applicant/accused shall inform it to I.O and also to the Court.
- 5] Applicant/accused is directed not to contact the informant and witnesses and not to tamper with the prosecution's evidence.
- 6] Applicant/accused is directed to attend the trial regularly.

(7) Sessions Case No. 189/2025
CNR No.MHBI010042472025
Order below Exh. 5

7] If there is violation of any of the condition, State is at liberty to file application for cancellation bail.

Beed,
Date : 09/04/2026

(Anand L. Yawalkar)
SESSIONS JUDGE, BEED.

(8)

Dictated on : 09/04/2026
Transcribed on : 09/04/2026
Checked & signed on : 09/04/2026

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file are word to word as per original Judgment / order.

Name of Steno : S. D. Kulkarni
Name of Court : Sessions Court, Beed,

Sd/-
(S.D. Kulkarni)
Stenographer Grade-I