

Cri. Bail Appl. No.218/2026
CNR No. MHOS010009112026
Amol Ravindra Korde & Anr. (1)
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra

ORDER BELOW EXH.1

1. This is bail application filed under section 482 of B.N.S.S. for anticipatory bail in Crime No.225/2026 registered with Tuljapur Police Station for the offence punishable under sections 115 (2), 118(1), 118(2), 351 (1), 352, 3 (5) of B.N.S. 2023.

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informant, Parth Shashikant Karade, a resident of Tuljapur, lodged a report alleging that on 06.05.2026, after having dinner, he was sitting near the premises of the Zilla Parishad Office, Tuljapur, along with his friends, Prathamesh Kale and Prem Jathal, at about 10:30 p.m. At around 11:00 p.m., the present applicants, along with the co-accused, allegedly came to the said place and, owing to a previous dispute, assaulted the informant. It is alleged that one of the accused attempted to strike the informant on his head with a sharp weapon. However, while trying to evade the blow, the informant sustained injuries to his hand. The applicants and the other accused persons are further alleged to have assaulted the informant on his right leg with the said sharp weapon and also

caused injuries to his head and below the left leg. As a result of the assault, the informant was shifted to Yashodhara Hospital, Solapur, for medical treatment. On the basis of the report lodged by the informant, Crime No. 225 of 2026 came to be registered at Tuljapur Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 115, 118(2), 351(3), and 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. It is contended in the application that the applicants have not committed any offence and have been falsely implicated in the present crime. It is further stated that they were not present at the time of the alleged incident. The informant and the applicants are residents of the same village. Owing to previous enmity between them, the applicants have been falsely implicated in the crime at the instance of the informant. It is further contended that the main allegations are against accused Anoj Korde and that the allegations against the present applicants are limited to their alleged presence at the place of occurrence at the time of the incident. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the present applicants is not necessary, as there is no requirement for any seizure or recovery from their possession. On these grounds, the applicants have prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The Investigating Officer and the learned A.G.P. have filed their replies below Exhibits 11 and 14, respectively, inter alia

contending that the offence is serious in nature. It is further contended that, if released on bail, the applicants may exert pressure on the prosecution witnesses and hamper the course of investigation.

5. Heard learned A.G.P. Shri M. B. Deshmukh. He submitted that the offence is serious in nature. According to him, there is a possibility that the applicants may abscond if granted anticipatory bail. Therefore, he prayed for rejection of the present bail application.

6. Learned Advocate Shri V. V. Jagdale, appearing on behalf of the applicants/accused, submitted that the principal allegations are against accused Anoj Korde, who has already been released on regular bail by the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class by order dated 15.05.2026. Another accused, Manoj Mohan Kamble, has also been released on regular bail by the said Court. It is submitted that the allegations against the present applicants are trivial in nature and are confined to their alleged presence at the place of occurrence at the time of the incident. Their custodial interrogation is not necessary. The applicants are ready and willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by the Court. Hence, he prayed that the applicants be granted anticipatory bail.

7. I have carefully considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the applicants and the learned A.P.P. for the State. I have also perused the First Information Report, the injury certificate of the informant, and the other papers of investigation. At the outset, the FIR discloses that the alleged incident occurred on account of a previous dispute between the parties. It is alleged that the applicants, along with the co-accused, assaulted the informant. The prosecution case further reveals that about one and a half years prior to the incident, the informant had allegedly abused the accused persons, and owing to the said enmity, the applicants and their associates allegedly assaulted the informant with a sharp weapon, causing injuries to his hand, leg, and face. On the basis of the report lodged by the informant, Crime No. 225 of 2026 came to be registered against the applicants and the co-accused for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 351(1), 352 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. It is true that the offences alleged are triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate First Class but the punishment provided to the offence punishable under Section 118(2) of the BNS a sentence of imprisonment for life. Thus, the nature and gravity of the allegations, the manner in which the assault was allegedly committed, and the injuries sustained by the informant cannot be ignored while considering the prayer for anticipatory bail.

8. The injury certificate placed on record shows that the informant sustained the following injuries;

(i) Sharp cut injury over the volar aspect of the mid left forearm, with cut tendons visible in the wound; flexion of all fingers was restricted; distal sensation was absent, suggestive of median and ulnar nerve injury as well as ulnar artery injury.

(ii) Lacerated wound over the right knee.

(iii) Incised wound below the left eye.

The medical papers prima facie indicate that the injury to the left forearm is serious in nature and involves damage to tendons, nerves and blood vessels. The nature of these injuries lends support to the prosecution case that a sharp weapon was used during the assault.

9. It is true that co-accused Anuj Korde and Manoj Mohan Kamble have been released on regular bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class. However, the said circumstance by itself is not sufficient to grant anticipatory bail to the present applicants. The investigation is still in progress and there is nothing on record to show that the informant has fully recovered from the injuries sustained by him. The medical treatment of the informant and the circumstances surrounding the incident are still required to be investigated. Furthermore, it is not disputed that the informant and the present applicants are residents of the same village. Considering the previous enmity between the parties and the fact

that the material witnesses are from the same locality, the possibility of the applicants influencing, pressurising or intimidating the informant and other prosecution witnesses cannot be ruled out if they are granted the protection of anticipatory bail. Having regard to the nature of the accusations, the gravity of the injuries sustained by the informant, the role attributed to the applicants in the commission of the offence, and the requirement of a fair and effective investigation, I am of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the present applicants cannot be said to be wholly unnecessary at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail at this juncture may adversely affect the investigation. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, I do not find it to be a fit case for exercising the discretionary relief under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. Hence, the application deserves to be rejected.

ORDER

The application is rejected.

Date :- 01.06.2026

(R. K. Khomane)
I/c. District Judge-3 &
Additional Sessions Judge,
Dharashiv (Osmanabad).

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file judgment are same word to word as per the original Judgment.

Name of the Stenographer	:	Mahesh Abhimanyu Pawar, Stenographer Gr.I
Name of the Court	:	Addl. Sessions Judge, Osmanabad
Date of Judgment	:	01.06.2026
Judgment signed by the presiding officer	:	01.06.2026
Judgment uploaded on	:	01.06.2026