

MHJN110002212026



Order below Exh-1 in Cri. Bail Appln. No.109/2026
(Yashoda Uddhav Khare Vs State of Maharashtra)

This application U/s. 482 of B.N.S.S. is filed by the applicant Yashoda Uddhav Khare for releasing her on anticipatory bail in Crime No.40/2026 registered with Ambad Police station under sections 103 (1), 189, 190, 191 (2), 191 (3), 352, 351 (2) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

2] The applicant has contended that, her name is not mentioned in the FIR. False allegations is made against her in the supplementary statement. She was not present on the spot. She is falsely implicated, merely because she is mother of child-in-conflict-with-law. Nothing is to be recovered from her. She is ready to abide by any terms and conditions. She lastly prayed for allowing her application.

3] The investigation officer resisted the application by filing his say at Exh-4 wherein, it is contended that, this applicant called the other accused and also called the deceased in front of his house. She will not remain present in the Court. She lastly prayed for rejecting the application.

4] Heard, learned Advocate Mr. S. V. Mundlik for accused, learned AGP Mr. W. A. Ghuge for the state.

5] The FIR is lodged by father of deceased Pawan Borate. The FIR makes out that the informant has witnessed the incident. In the FIR the only allegation is against Rahul Khare (Child-in-conflict-with-law) that he inflicted blows of knife in the stomach of Pavan Borate son of informant. In the FIR there is no whisper against the present applicant, either of her presence on the spot or doing any overt-act. The informant in his supplementary recorded on very same day has made allegations against present applicant that, she caught his wife. Said allegation is not stated in the FIR. Thus, this aspect makes out the case of afterthought allegations against the present applicant. Had this applicant been really present on the spot and had caught the wife of the informant, then, the informant who has witnessed the incident certainly would have stated said fact in his FIR which is not so.

6] Thus, said aspect comes to the help of present applicant who is woman for the purpose of pre-arrest bail. There is no allegations in the supplementary statement that the present applicant was in possession of any weapon. Hence, nothing is to be recovered from her. Thus, I conclude that the applicant is entitled to bail with certain conditions. Accordingly, I pass following order.

ORDER

- a] Application is allowed.
- b] In the event of arrest of applicant **Yashoda Uddhav Khare** in Crime No.40/2026 registered with Ambad Police station under sections 103 (1),

189, 190, 191 (2), 191 (3), 352, 351 (2) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, be released on pre-arrest bail on executing PR bond and SB of Rs.15,000/- with one or more surety in the like amount or cash security.

- c] Applicant shall mark her presence in Ambad Police Station as and when required by Investigating Officer and co-operate in the investigation.
- d] Applicant shall not pressurize the informant and prosecution witnesses in any manner.
- e] Applicant shall not tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- f] Applicant shall not leave the India without permission of the Court.
- g] Inform concern police station accordingly.

Date: 23-03-2026

(S. B. Gaidhani)
Addl. Sessions Judge, Ambad

Certificate

“I affirm that the contents of this PDF File are word to word as per original order”.

Name of the Steno : Navnath D. Sahane
Name of the Court : Additional Sessions Judge, Ambad
Date : 23-03-2026

sd/-
Signature of Stenographer