



ORDER BELOW EXH No. 9
IN SESSION CASE No. 58/2025

(State *v.* Ritik Dinesh Yadav)

1. This bail application is filed in Crime No. 106 of 2025 registered at Devgad Police Station for the offence punishable under section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (the “BNS”).
2. Perused relevant papers from the case file, the contents of the bail application, and the say of the State.
3. Heard.
4. I have perused the FIR. The applicant is facing trial for offence punishable under section 103(1) BNS. It is the allegation that on 15.07.2025 at about 09:00 pm the applicant committed murder of Krushnakumar Yadav.
5. Ld advocate for the applicant submits that the applicant was arrested on 16.07.2025. His age is 20 years. This is the first bail application. There is no eye witness. There is only the extra judicial confession allegedly made by the accused at the time of the alleged recovery of the spanner which was allegedly used by the applicant to kill the deceased. He submits that even if the theory is alternatively taken as true, there was no intention to kill. He submits that the applicant shall not leave the jurisdiction of this court although he is

from different state. He shall follow all bail conditions. Hence, considering the time spent by the applicant in the jail, bail may be granted to him.

6. Ld ADPP submits on the lines of State say Exh 11 and Police say Exh 12. He submits that the applicant may abscond. The beating was intentional. There is skull fracture shown in the PM report. The State shall expedite the trial.
7. The informant was present. The informant narrated as to how the applicant was apprehend and as to how he confessed the crime. Not only this, the informant also told how the applicant was taken to the police station.
8. My observations are as follows.
9. There is prima facie evidence against the applicant. He was apprehended by the informant and some other persons and was taken to the police station. The applicant confessed that he committed the murder of Krushnakumar by hitting the spanner in his head four-five times. Although such confessions are not admissible, there is the discovery and recovery of the spanner at the instance of the accused. Allegedly the dispute had taken place between the applicant and the deceased over the cigarette lighter. Under such circumstances it would not be safe to release the accused on bail, particularly when the Ld ADPP has assured that he would expedite the trial.

10. With the above observations, I am rejecting the present bail application. If the prosecution evidence does not conclude within six months, the applicant shall at liberty to file fresh bail application, if so advised, after six months.
11. Resultantly, I pass the following Order.

O R D E R

The bail application (Exh 9) is rejected.

Place: Sindhudurg at Oros
Date: 04.02.2026

(Dr Sudhiir M Deshpande)
Sessions Judge
Sindhudurg at Oros