


| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, KHAMGAON, DISTRICT – BULDHANA Present : G.B. Jadhav, Additional Sessions Judge | |
| Sessions Case No.23/2026 State of Maharashtra Vs Yogesh Ramdas Tade & others | |
| MHBU040001162026  | Crime No.490/2025 registered at Police Station Jalgaon Jamod, Taluka: Jalgaon Jamod, District Buldhana for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. |
| Applicant | Yogesh Ramdas Tade, Age – 22 years, Occupation – Labour, R/o: Ayodhya Nagar/Tabilpura, Jalgaon Jamod, Tq.Jalgaon Jamod, Dist.Buldhana. |
| Represented by | Mr.V. T. Dharme, Ld. Advocate. |
| Respondent | State of Maharashtra Police Station Jalgaon Jamod, Dist.Buldhana. |
| Represented by | Ku.R.D.Bawaskar, Ld. A.P.P |

ORDER BELOW EXH.27
(Passed on 27.04.2026)

1] Present application has been filed by the applicant/accused No.1 namely Yogesh Ramdas Tade, under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail in Crime No.490/2025 registered at Jalgaon Jamod Police Station,

Tq.Jalgaon Jamod, Dist. Buldhana for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2] Learned APP Ku. R.D.Bawaskar has resisted the application by filing say at Exh.28. It is contended that alleged offence is serious offence. Seized muddemal sent to the Amravati and its analysis report is yet to receive. Complainant and accused resides in the same Mohalla , therefore, if accused released on bail then again cognizable offence is likely to take place. If accused released on bail then he will pressurize the witnesses. Hence, requested to reject the application.

3] Original informant has resisted the application by filing protest petition vide Exh.33 through advocate L.J.Bhansali in the line of FIR and say of APP. Hence, requested to reject the application.

4] Learned Advocate Mr. Dildar Khan, on behalf of applicant/ accused has submitted that applicant is behind the bar since 22.10.2025. He submitted that investigation has been completed and police have submitted the charge sheet. Therefore, his custodial interrogation is not necessary. He submitted that applicant is 22 years young boy and he has no criminal antecedent. He submitted that the Hon'ble Bombay High Court Bench at Nagpur vide order dated 09.04.2026 in Criminal Application (BA) No.380/2026 has released the accused No.2 on regular bail . Hence, considering the observation of said bail order, applicant be released on bail on the ground of parity. He submitted that applicant/accused is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions of bail if he released on bail.

Considering all these aspects, prayed for releasing the applicant/accused on bail.

5] Learned APP Smt.R.D.Bawaskar, has submitted that applicant is main accused who committed serious offence of murder. She submitted that there is sufficient material against him. Hence she urged to reject the application.

6] I have thoughtfully considered the submission of both sides. Perused the application, say filed by the APP as well as original informant. I have perused the documents placed on record by the applicant/accused as well as the charge sheet. I have perused the bail order of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court placed on record.

7] After perusal of charge sheet, it shows that complainant Vinay Hiranman Hissal, Resident of Ruplal Nagar, Jalgaon Jamod has lodged the report on 22/10/2025 at Jalgaon Jamod Police Station against total three accused in which applicant is accused No.1. It is alleged that, on 20/10/2025 he along with his brother Atul Hissal and Amol Hissal had been to their house at Jalgaon Jamod from Pune for Diwali. It is alleged that, on 21/10/2025 at about 8:30 a.m. complainant and cousin brother Aashish Dhage were present near Gajanan Maharaj Temple at Jalgaon Jamod. At that time, his cousin sister Swati Hissal made him phone call and stated that, accused Yogesh Tade and his friend were beating to Amol Hissal. Therefore, complainant along with his brother Aashish Dhage went to the

Ayodhya Nagar, Jalgaon Jamod. They saw that, applicant accused No. 1 Yogesh Tade by holding the head of Amol Hissal was hitting it on the ota in front of house of Sonaji Tade and accused No. 2 Shubham Tade and accused No. 3 Dnyaneshwar Kothalkar were beating Amol by kicks and fist- blows on his chest, back and head. Therefore, complainant has released the quarrel and asked his brother Amol about the incident. Amol told him when he was standing near the Peepal tree at Ayodhya Nagar, accused Yogesh Tade and Shubham Tade have thrown the fire cracker on his person. Due to it there was quarrel taken place between them. Hence, Yogesh Tade, Shubham Tade have beaten him on his chest, back and head by kick and fist-blows. At that time, accused No. 3 Dnyaneshwar Kothalkar came there and he also beaten him by kick and fist- blows on his chest, back and head. Accused Dnyaneshwar by screwdriver beaten him on his forehead. Thereafter, he went to the house of Bebi Hissal. Thereafter, he went to the Ayodhya Nagar near the Peepal tree. When complainant was carrying to his brother Amol by his motorcycle towards house, near the Rana Bar, Amol fallen down. Therefore, he immediately taken him to the Rural Hospital Jalgaon Jamod, Doctor declared him dead.

8] There is complicity of accused in serious offence of murder. This Court has rejected the bail application of accused. After perusal of charge-sheet prima facie it shows that, there is sufficient evidence against the accused. Therefore, he is not entitled to be released on bail on the ground of parity. Though, the Hon'ble High Court has

... 5 ...

**Order below Exh.27
in Sessions Case No. 23/2026**

granted the bail to the accused No.2 but his role is different than the present accused.

9] In the light of above discussion considering the seriousness of offence and role of applicant/accused, I am not inclined to release the applicant/accused on bail. Hence, application deserves to be rejected. In result I pass the following order :-

ORDER

Application Exh.27 is hereby rejected.

Date :- 27/04/2026

[G.B.Jadhav]
Additional Sessions Judge,
Khamgaon, Dist.Buldhana.

... 6 ...

**Order below Exh.27
in Sessions Case No. 23/2026**

Certificate

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file is correct, word to word as per original order.

Name of Court : Addl. Sessions Judge, Khamgaon,
Dist.Buldana.

Name of Steno : G.P. Bhonde (Stenographer Grade-II)

Dictated on : 27.04.2026

Checked & Signed on : 27.04.2026

Decided on : 27.04.2026

Uploaded on : 27.04.2026