

Order below Exh. 8 in Sessions Case No. 100/2025

(Tanaji Jamadar Vs. State of Maharashtra)



CNRNO.MHLA010018662025

1] This is application u/s. 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of bail to the applicant, in Crime No. 912/2024, registered with M.I.D.C. Police Station Latur, for the offence punishable under Sections 103, 109, 333, 78, 351 (3) of the B.N.S., 2023.

2] Heard learned advocate Mr. S.S. Nalegaonkar for applicant and learned A.G.P. Mr. L.N. Shinde for the State. Perused application, say filed by the prosecution and the chargesheet.

3] It is the case of first informant Madhubala that Ravina (deceased) was her married daughter, due to dispute with her husband, Ravina used to reside separately adjoining to her house, applicant Tanaji is her relative, who used to harass Ravina and used to chase her, first informant and her husband tried to give him understanding, on 25/12/2024 in the morning at 4.00 a.m., she heard shouting of Ravina, when first informant went to the room of Ravina, at that time applicant came out from the room of Ravina and ran away, first informant found that Ravina was lying in the pool of blood, Ravina was admitted in the hospital, she lodged the complaint, initially crime was registered u/Sec. 109 of BNS, 2023, Ravina died while taking treatment on 02/01/2025, hence Sec. 103(1) of BNS, 2023 came to be added.

4] Learned advocate for applicant Mr. S.S. Nalegaonkar submits that the alleged incident took place on 25/12/2024, whereas Ravina died on 02/01/2025, so investigating officer could have

recorded dying declaration of Ravina, but no such dying declaration is on record, spot panchanama did not show that Madhubala resides adjoining to the room of Ravina, chargesheet is filed on 21/03/2025, applicant is behind the bar since last more than 10 months, trial will take its own time to conclude, no fruitful purpose will be served to keep the applicant behind the bar, hence bail may kindly be granted to the applicant.

5] Whereas, learned AGP submits that applicant committed murder of one young married women, who is having one teenager girl, who refused to keep any relationship with the applicant, there is recovery of knife at the instance of applicant, applicant cut the throat of Ravina, hence, she was unable to give statement and hence, her dying declaration could not recorded, but there is one hand written note of Ravina indicating involvement of applicant, which is a serious crime, prosecution is ready to proceed with the matter expeditiously, first informant and other witnesses are relatives of the applicant, hence there is every possibility of pressurizing them, hence, bail may be rejected.

6] On perusal of FIR, it appears that on the day of incident, Madhubala Yashvant not only heard shouting of Ravina, but also she saw the applicant to come out from the room of Ravina, Madhubala saw that Ravina was lying in pool of blood, as she sustained severe injuries on her throat, Madhubala informed said fact immediately to her husband Suryakant and neighbouring person. It appears that there is recovery of knife at the instance of applicant pursuant to his disclosure statement. P.M. Report indicates that Ravina sustained severe injury on her throat, weapon query report issued by the Medical Officer indicates

that one blood stained knife was forwarded and injuries mentioned in the P.M. Report are possible, due to use of such type of weapon.

7] Chargesheet indicates that there is one hand written note of Ravina indicating that applicant came in her room forcibly and cut her throat. It appears that though Ravina was alive for few days after the incident, but considering the nature of injuries sustained to her, it was practically not possible for her to speak any word. Hence, investigating officer could not record her oral dying declaration, but by way of this hand written note, investigating officer succeeded to record her statement. As per the case of prosecution, motive to commit the murder is that Ravina, who is already married woman with one teenager daughter, refused to keep any type of relations with the applicant.

8] It is pertinent to note that applicant is relative of first informant and there is nothing on record to indicate that first informant implicated him in a false case that too, such a serious crime. On the contrary, chargesheet prima facie, indicates that sufficient circumstances are available to show the involvement of the applicant, in the present offence which is heinous one. Considering all the facts and circumstances, no case is made out for grant of bail. Hence, I proceed to pass the following order.

ORDER

Application stands rejected.

Dated : 24.11.2025.

(S.J. Bharuka)
Sessions Judge, Latur