

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE BULDHANA.
(Presided Over by Ravikumar K. Sharma)



Session Case No. 93/2024
The State Of Maharashtra.
V/s.
Sunil Dhotre and the Others.

APPEARANCE : Mr. V. P. Marodkar, Ld. Advocate for the Accused.
Mr. A. A. Kesale, Ld. APP for the State.

ORDER BELOW EXHIBIT 162.
(Passed on 02.04.2026)

01. The accused Sandip Dilip Kadam (Accused No.7) filed this application U/s. 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail, in Crime No. 49/2024, registered in P.S., Andhera for the Offences U/sect. 395, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code (this trial).
02. Briefly the prosecution case is that the informant Rameshwar Shrimali was employed by Santosh Mundala for his company namely Rajuri Steel Company. On the day of incident 14.02.2024 informant was collected cash from the various dealers and was carrying Rs. 27 Lakhs with him collected from the various shop keepers. On 14.02.2024, the accused and his companion committed the offence of dacoity of Rs. 27 Lakhs and fled away along-with the amount. After some time the informant and his companion rescued themselves and accordingly, a Crime was registered against unknown 7 to 8 persons. It appears from the record that other accused namely Kacharu, Dharasing, Bhagwat, Vishnu, Bahadur and Sunil have already been granted bail by the Court of Sessions.
03. The accused/applicant has prayed that he has to maintain his family, he is law abiding person. He is ready to abide by the condition

of bail and therefore, he may be released on bail.

04. The APP objected this application in view of say (Exhibit 177) as there is sufficient material against the accused. He played the important role in commission of this offence. This accused was already in the Kopergaon jail. He is habitual offender. The offence is serious in nature. The amount of 1.5 lakh came to be seized as per the muddemal receipt. The offence is very serious in nature. He would tamper with the prosecution and may pressurize the witnesses. Hence, his application is liable to be rejected.

05. Considering the submission of parties, and the record, at the outset, it is worth to be noted that on the eventful day, this applicant/accused has committed dacoity of Rs. 27 lakh which is huge in nature. There is no change in the circumstances. Already his bail application, filed earlier was rejected by the Court of Sessions twice. On perusal of record, prima facie it appears that he is habitual offender and no specific reason is mentioned for his bail as change in circumstances. This way, the accusations against him seem well founded. I am afraid the contention sought to be impressed upon by the learned counsel is justifiable in the wake of the observation of my learned predecessor in the order Dt.15.01.2025. It appears that the learned counsel seems to have lost sight of the observation of my learned predecessor vis-a-vis the role played by this particular accused which is attributed to be major as compared to accused Darasing and others. While declining to grant bail, this particular observation of my learned predecessor appears decisive in nature. Though, the accused is stated to have been acquitted, however, the fact cannot be denied that he is having criminal antecedents. Rather, any interference in the observations of my learned predecessor rejecting the bail application may tantamount to almost reviewing the earlier order,

without there being any change in circumstances in real sense. Thus, despite the fact that the report was lodged against other accused and some of them have been released on bail. The investigation is over and charge sheet is filed. However, that, by itself, can not be the sole reason to release him on bail specially when he seems to have committed the offences and the prosecution is yet to unfold its case on trial. Being so, his possibilities to hamper the prosecution case and to jump the bail can't be completely ruled out. Consequently, I am not inclined to release him on bail and hence, this application needs to be rejected. Hence, the Order:

-: ORDER :-

01. The application (Exhibit 162), for grant of bail, is rejected.

Buldhana.
Dated : 02.04.2026.

(R. K. Sharma)
Addl. Sessions Judge, Buldhana.
District : Buldhana.

Certificate

“I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file Order are same word for word as per original Order.

Name of the Steno. :- C. N. Mahale (Grade-I)
Name of the Court :- Addl. Sessions Judge
(Court No.3), Buldhana
Dictated on :- 02.04.2026.
Transcribed on :- 02.04.2026.
Checked and Signed :- 02.04.2026.
on
Date of uploaded :- 02.04.2026.