



Received on : 30/08/2024  
Registered on : 03/09/2024  
Decided on : 13/03/2026  
Duration on : Y-1 M-6 D-12

<b>IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL JUDGE AT SOLAPUR</b>	
<b>Present : Manoj S. Sharma, Special Judge Date of the Judgment – 13/03/2026</b>	
<b>Special Case No. 268 / 2024 CNR : MHSO-1002360-2024</b>	
<b>Exh. 41 "A"</b>	
FIR No.349/2024 of Mohol Police Station, Tal.Mohol, Dist.Solapur	
<b>COMPLAINANT</b>	State of Maharashtra
<b>REPRESENTED BY</b>	Learned APP Mr. A. G. Kurdukar,
<b>ACCUSED</b>	Chandrakant Maruti Mote Age : 50 years, Occ. – Service R/o. Valuj, Tal. Mohol, Dist.Solapur.
<b>REPRESENTED BY</b>	Mr. D. E. Mane Advocate for the accused.

Date of Offence	29/05/2024
Date of FIR	29/05/2024
Date of Charge-sheet	29/08/2024
Date of Framing of Charge	11/04/2025
Date of commencement of evidence	20/08/2025
Date on which judgment is reserved	13/03/2026
Date of the Judgment	13/03/2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	NA

**Accused Details**

Rank of Accused	Name of the accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428 Cr.PC.
1	Chandrakant Maruti Mote	02/07/2024	02/07/2024	Section 323 504 of IPC & Section 3(1)(r)(s) & 3(2)(va) of SC & ST Act	Acquitted	NA	--

**LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT WITNESSES****A. Prosecution :**

RANK	NAME	EXH	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
PW-1	Akshat Jalindar Kasbe	14	First informant
PW-2	Dnyanoba Vasekar	17	Panch
PW-3	Manoj Prabhakar Mote	25	Witness
PW-4	Nilesh Abhiman Raut	28	Witness
PW-5	Sanket Nathuram Devare	33	Investigating officer

**B. Defence Witnesses, if any :**

RANK	NAME	EXH.	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
--	-----	---	----

**C. Court Witnesses, if any :**

RANK	NAME	EXH.	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
--	----	---	---

**LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT EXHIBITS****A. Prosecution :**

Sr. N	Exhibit	Description
1	15	FIR
2	16	Statement under section 164 of Cr.PC.
3	21	School leaving certificate
4	22	Caste certificate of the informant
5	18	Spot panchanama

**B. Defence :**

Sr. N	Exhibit Number	Description
--	--	--

**C. Court Exhibits**

Sr. N	Exhibit Number	Description
1	---	---

**D. Material Objects :**

Sr. N	Exhibit Number	Description
1	--	----

**JUDGEMENT**(Delivered on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026)

1. Accused Chandrakant Maruti Mote stood tried for the offences punishable under section 323, 504 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter to be referred as "IPC") and section 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2) (va) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter to be referred as "Atrocities Act").

**The case of the prosecution, in brief, is as under;-**

2. On 29/05/2024, the informant Akshay Kasabe lodged an FIR with Police Station, Mohol alleging that, on 29/05/2024 at about 10.00 a.m., when he was going to Mohol for purchasing flour mill and when he reached near Indian Oil Petrol Pump, Narkhed, that time, this accused met him at said petrol pump at about 11.00 a.m., that time, the informant was standing with his friend Manoj Mote and Nilesh Raut. He inquired with accused, as to whether, he has prepared a panchanama regarding damage caused to the crops in the agricultural land of Manoj Mote, due to thunder storm, upon which, this accused alleged to have hurled abuses on his cast and slapped on his face and told him, as to he may do whatever he want. That time, his friend Manoj Mote and Nilesh intervened and accused went

away from there and therefore, he claimed that, accused intentionally abused him on his caste.

3. In view of such allegations Crime No. 349/2024 for the offences punishable under section 323, 504 of IPC and section 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Atrocities Act came to be registered against this accused at police station Mohol and investigation of crime was handed over to Sub Divisional Police officer Sanket Devalekar, who, after taking over the investigation procured school leaving certificate from the informant, then, he visited spot of incident and prepared spot panchanama. Thereafter, he recorded statement of witnesses and also got statement of witnesses recorded as per section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Then, during the investigation conducted by him, it was revealed to him that, the crime was committed under the Atrocities Act and therefore, he filed charge sheet against the accused.

4. My learned predecessor framed charge for the offences punishable under section 323 and 504 of IPC and section 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Atrocities Act, came to be framed below Exh.9 against the accused. He pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5. Upon commencing the trial, in all, the prosecution examined five witnesses and closed the evidence by filing a pursis below Exh.36. Thereafter, the statement of the accused as per section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was recorded below Exh. 37. His defence is of total denial and he has come with the specific stand that, he has filed a case bearing Crime No. 348/2024 against Dayanand, Nilesh and Yogesh and therefore, all those three persons therefore to take revenge, through informant, they filed this false case.

6. Heard learned APP for the State and learned advocate for the accused persons.

7. In the light of evidence on record and rival submissions made at bar, following points arise for consideration.

**POINTS**

**FINDINGS**

- |   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Do the prosecution prove that, on 29/05/2024 at about 11.00 a.m., near Indian Oil Petrol Pump at Narkhed, Tal. Mohol, Dist. Solapur, accused voluntarily caused hurt to the informant Akshar Kasbe and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 323 of IPC ?   | No. |
| 2 | Do the prosecution prove that, on aforesaid date, time and place, accused intentionally insulted the informant Akshat Kasbe by words “ये मांगाड्या मला रस्त्यात अडवून पंचनाम्याबाबत विचारायला तु काय झागीरदार आहे का मांगा महाराची जात तुमची मागुन खाणारी तुम्ही माइ-यावर रुबाब करता का?” and thereby gave provocation to him, intending or knowing it to be likely that, such provocation would cause him to break public peace or to commit any other offence and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 504 of IPC ?                            | No. |
| 3 | Do the prosecution prove that, on aforesaid date, time and place, accused not being a member of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe and intentionally insulted or intimidated with intent to humiliate to the informant Akshay Kasbe, who belongs to Hindu Mang community and uttered words “ये मांगाड्या मला रस्त्यात अडवून पंचनाम्याबाबत विचारायला तु काय झागीरदार आहे का? मांगा महाराची जात तुमची मागुन खाणारी तुम्ही माइ-यावर रुबाब करता का?” within public view and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 3(1)(r)(s) of the Atrocities Act ? | No. |

4. Do the prosecution prove that, on aforesaid date, time and place, accused not being a member of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe committed an offence specified in the schedule against the informant Akshay Kasbe and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 3(2)(va) of the Atrocities Act ?

No.

5. What order ?

Accused is acquitted.

All the points are accordingly answered for the reason stated below;

### REASONS

8. In so far as the evidence, on the basis of which the prosecution wanted to discharge the burden, is concerned, it is both oral as well as documentary.

9. In so far as the oral evidence is concerned following witnesses have been examined by the prosecution, viz.,

RANK	NAME	EXH	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
PW-1	Akshat Jalindar Kasbe	14	First informant
PW-2	Dnyanoba Vasekar	17	Panch
PW-3	Manoj Prabhakar Mote	25	Witness
PW-4	Nilesh Abhiman Raut	28	Witness
PW-5	Sanket Nathuram Devare	33	Investigating officer

10. In so far as the documents are concerned, following documents placed on record;-

Sr. N	Exhibit	Description
1	15	FIR

2	16	Statement under section 164 of Cr.P.C.
3	21	School leaving certificate
4	22	Caste certificate of the informant
5	18	Spot panchanama

**As to point No. 3 :**

11. In so far as charge for the offence punishable under section 3(1)(r)(s) of the Atrocities Act against the accused is concerned, it was the burden on the prosecution to establish beyond reasonable doubt that, accused intentionally insulted or intimidated the informant with intent to humiliate him, he being the member of Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe within a public view and hurled abuses on the informant, who is member of Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe by caste name within a public view.

12. To discharge the said burden, firstly the prosecution was under obligation to establish that, PW-1 Akshay Kasabe, the informant belong to Scheduled Caste and to prove the same, the prosecution examined PW-1 Akshay Kasabe himself, who deposed that, he belonged to Hindu Mahar community and to prove the same, he has produced school leaving certificate below Exh. 21 and copy of the caste certificate below Exh.22.

13. In so far as school leaving certificate below Exh. 21 is concerned, same can not be considered to be a proof of caste of PW-1 Akshay Kasabe, however, copy of caste certificate below Exh.22, it was verified from the original in the court, clearly show that, PW-1 Akshay Kasabe belonged to Mang caste, serial No. 46 which is recognized as Scheduled Caste. Thus, no doubt remained as to caste of PW-1 Akshay

Kasabe, nothing is brought on record by the accused to show that, either he belong to Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe nor any such claim is made by the accused and therefore, it is clear that, he do not belong to Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe.

14. In so far as allegation of intentional insult and hurling abuses on caste of PW-1 Akshay Kasabe at a place which is in public view knowing that, he belongs to scheduled caste are concerned, PW-1 Akshay Kasabe deposed that, on 29/05/2024, he proceeded towards Mohol from his home for bringing flour mill, that time, he proceeded alone and the time then was 10.00 a.m., he was waiting for vehicle on a road, that time, PW-3 Manoj Mote and PW-4 Nilesh Raut were abusing from there by a bike. They stopped near him and inquired from him, as to where, he was proceeding. Then, they were chatting for 20 to 25 minutes and both PW-3 Mahesh Mote and PW-4 Nilesh Raut told him that, they will accompany him for bringing flour mill, then, all three of them proceeded on motorcycle and took a stop near one shop. They reached near Indian Oil Petrol Pump, where, accused was present and that time, PW-3 Mahesh uttered that, he will ask accused regarding progress of a panchanama for compensation on account of storm and accordingly, he asked accused regarding the same.

15. Thereafter, PW-1 Akshay Kasabe and PW-4 Nilesh Raut reached there and as per version of PW-1 Akshay Kasabe, he asked accused regarding progress of panchanama for compensation, upon which, accused asked him, as to who he is to ask him on the road, then, accused uttered “मांगट्या, महारा मांगाची जात तुम्ही मागून खाणारी माणसं”. Then, accused slapped on his face. Then, accused also said, do whatever he want. Then, PW-3 Manoj

Mote and PW-4 Nilesh Raut asked accused, as to why he was beating PW-1 Akshay Kasabe. They rescued him and then, accused proceeded towards Narkhed. They stayed there for 10 to 15 minutes. Thereafter, they proceeded towards Mohol police station and filed a complaint. Said FIR is below Exh. 15. His statement as per section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is below Exh. 16. Thus, in so far as allegations of intentional insult and abuses on caste are concerned, words which has come on record through evidence of this witness are “मांगट्या, महारा मांगाची जात तुम्ही मागून खाणारी माणसं”.

16. On the other hand, PW-3 Mahesh Mote deposed that, PW-1 Akshay Kasabe and PW-4 Nilesh Raut are his friends and he and PW-4 Nilesh are engaged in agricultural work, while, PW-1 Akshay runs a tumtum auto rickshaw. As per his version, on 29/05/2024 at about 11.00 a.m., they were present on the road in front of Indian Oil Petrol Pump and at that time, accused arrived there by motorcycle, that time, PW-1 Akshay stopped him and asked accused in respect of preparation of panchanama of damage on account of storm caused to him. That time, accused asked PW-1 Akshay as to what is his connection respect of the same. Then, accused uttered words “मागून खाणारी जात” and slapped him. Then, PW-4 Nilesh pacified the dispute. Thereafter, accused left spot of incident and then proceeded to Mohol. Then, PW-1 Akshay lodged an FIR.

17. Another important witness is PW-4 Nilesh Raut, as per whose version, accused is Talathi of village Narkhed and caste of PW-1 Akshay is Mang. He deposed that, on the day of incident, he himself, PW-1 Akshay and PW-3 Manoj were present on the road in front of Indian Oil Petrol Pump, Narkhed, that time, accused arrived there by motorcycle and that

time, PW-1 Akshay and PW-3 Manoj stopped accused. They asked accused, as to whether, he prepared panchanama of incident that one tamarind tree fell on the shed of PW-3 Manoj. At that time, accused uttered “तु काय जहागीरदार लागून गेलाय काय ए मांगट्या”. He further uttered “तुमची महारा मांगाची जात, तुम्ही मागून खाणारे, माइ-यावर रुबाब करता काय”. Then, accused gave one slap to PW-1 Akshay. Thereafter, accused left the spot of incident.

18. These are only three witnesses who are examined by the prosecution to discharge the burden for the offence punishable under section 3(1)(r)(s) of the Atrocities Act.

19. Learned APP submitted that, all three witnesses deposed in consonance with each other and testimony of PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh are not corroborative to the version of PW-1 Akshay and therefore, the prosecution has discharged the burden and proved that, accused has committed offence punishable under section 3(1)(r)(s) of the Atrocities Act.

20. While, learned advocate for the accused vehemently argued that, there are serious discrepancies in the version of all three witnesses and if they are considered together, they casts serious doubt on entire case of the prosecution.

21. In so far as claim of discrepancies in the version made by advocate for the accused is concerned, if the manner of incident as claimed by each witness is concerned, then, it reveals that, on 29/05/2024 PW-1 Akshay Kasabe claimed to have proceeded for village Mohol from his home for bringing flour mill, he proceeded alone and he was waiting for

vehicle on road, that time, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh arrived there. Then, they all three proceeded on a motorcycle and stopped near a shop. Then, they reached near petrol pump, accused was present there. That time, PW-3 Manoj said that, he will ask accused and went towards the accused. Thereafter, he and PW-4 Nilesh reached there.

22. As per version of PW-3 Manoj, on 29/05/2024 at about 11.00 a.m., he, PW-1 Akshay and PW-4 Nilesh were present on the road in front of Indian Oil Petrol Pump of village Narkhed, that time, accused arrived there and PW-1 Akshay stopped him and he asked accused in respect of preparing panchanama of damage on account of storm caused to PW-3 Manoj. Thus, there is a discrepancies in the version of PW-1 Akshay and PW-3 Manoj regarding taking place of events. As per version of PW-1 Akshay, PW-3 Manoj went to ask accused regarding progress of panchanama and thereafter, PW-1 Akshay and PW-4 Nilesh reached there. Then, PW-1 Akshay asked accused regarding progress of panchanama for compensation.

23. While, as per version of PW-4 Nilesh, on the day of incident, when he, PW-1 Akshay and PW-3 Manoj were present on that day he road in front of Indian Oil Petrol Pump of village Narkhed, accused arrived there by motorcycle and that time, PW-1 Akshay and PW-3 Manoj stopped accused and they both asked accused, as to whether, he did panchanama of the incident regarding one tamarind tree fell on the shed of PW-3 Mahesh. Thus, it can be clearly seen that, version of these witnesses differs from the version of PW-3 Manoj. As per his version of PW-1 Akshay and PW- 3 Manoj stopped the accused. While, as per version of PW-3 Manoj, it was PW-1 Akshay, who stopped accused and as per version of PW-1

Akshay, accused was already present near Indian Petrol Pump and PW-3 Manoj proceeded ahead to ask accused regarding preparation of panchanama.

24. Another serious discrepancies is in respect of the words alleged to have been uttered by the accused, on the basis of which, it is claimed by the prosecution that, offence punishable under section 3(1)(r) (s) of the Atrocities Act has been committed by the accused. As per version of PW-1 Akshay, accused uttered words “मांगट्या, महारा मांगाची जात तुम्ही मागून खाणारी माणसं”. While, as per version of PW-3 Manoj words uttered by the accused were “मागून खाणारी जात”. While, as per version of PW-4 Nilesh accused uttered words “तु काय जहागीरदार लागून गेलाय काय ए मांगट्या” and “तुमची महारा मांगाची जात, तुम्ही मागून खाणारे, माझ-यावर रुबाब करता काय”.

25. It is important to note here that, PW-1 Akshay, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh, all three witnesses claimed to be together and in their presence, accused has uttered word, but, if the version of PW-1 Akshay, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh regarding words uttered by the accused to insult PW-1 Akshay and hurling abuses on his caste are considered, version of each witness is different from each other and do not match with each other. This discrepancy touches root of the matter and it is difficult to accept, as to exactly which words were uttered by the accused and whether those words were uttered by him or not. These discrepancies casts a serious doubt on the allegation so levelled by the prosecution on the accused.

26. Learned advocate for the accused further argued that, there is a terrible delay in lodging of FIR, as the incident is alleged to have taken

place at about 11.00 a.m. on 29/05/2024, while, FIR came to be lodged by PW-1 Akshay at about 11.55 p.m. on 29/05/2024 i.e., after more than 12 hours. He further submitted that, no explanation is tendered by the prosecution for such terrible delay.

27. There is a force in the submissions made by learned advocate for the accused, as if the version of PW-1 Akshay, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh are considered, then, incident took place at 11.00 a.m. on 29/05/2024 on the road near Indian Oil Petrol Pump of village Narkhed and they deposed that, after the incident PW-1 Akshay went to Mohol Police Station for lodging of an FIR. In his cross-examination, PW-1 Akshay admitted that, it takes 25 to 30 minutes to reach Mohol from the said petrol pump, where, the incident alleged to have taken place.

28. The evidence also reveals that, at the relevant time, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh had a motorcycle with them. Thus, when it require only 25 to 30 minutes to Mohol where police station is situated, it should not have taken more than 12 hours to reach Mohol and to lodge FIR. It is not a case of the prosecution that, in all these witnesses or all of them were under threat to their life and they were fearing to approach police station. Also no explanation have been tendered by the prosecution for such a terrible delay so caused in lodging of an FIR. Considering all the circumstances, certainly the question of delay touches the root of the matter and makes the case of prosecution more doubtful. It is not a case that, always delay so caused in lodging of FIR is fatal to the prosecution.

29. It is settled principle that, lodging of FIR carries more weightage, as it assures to the versions of incident and delay indicates

outcome of the afterthought. Prompt lodging of an FIR is also very essential to set the wheels of law in motion at the earliest. If there is any delay and if it is satisfactorily explained, then, it is not fatal to the case of prosecution. However, unexplained inordinate delay is always fatal for the prosecution. In the case in hand, as already observed herein before, there is a delay of more than 12 hours and same is unexplained. Also, event itself suggest that, there was no hindrance or any factor due to which, arrival of PW-1 Akshay in police station got delayed.

30. Further more, learned advocate for the accused submitted that, facts of the case are absolutely otherwise and in fact at about 10.00 a.m. of 29/05/2024, this accused was in his office situated at village Narkhed and he was working as a Talathi. That time, one Dayanand Raut came to his office and asked him, as to why, he did not do his work of court distribution. In response to the same, this accused told him that, he has already sent his file to Tahsildar, Mohol, but, said Dayanand Raut started hurling abuses at her, threw all the documents kept on the table and slapped on his face and said to him to go out, he will see him. Thereafter, he closed his office and went to agricultural land of Kakasaheb Khandare situated at Narkhed to assess the damage caused to Mango trees, due to storm on 26/05/2024 and when he was proceeding to village Khandare on his motorcycle and reached near agricultural land of one Kakasaheb Patil, that time, Dayanand Raut came on a motorcycle. He stopped him, then, caught hold of his collar and torn of his shirt and threatened and told him that, he will file a false case of atrocity against him. He assaulted the accused, that time, on another motorcycle Yogesh Raut came and made an assault on his finger of his both hands by stone. Then, said Dayanand Raut assaulted on his back, hands and legs by stick.

That time, Suresh Ghodake and Popat Kale intervened and saved him. Thereafter, he went to Rural Hospital at Mohol, lodged an FIR. In view of such allegations, vide Crime No. 348/2024 for the offences punishable under section 353, 332, 341, 324, 323, 504, 506 read with section 34 of IPC came to be registered against Dayanand Raut and Yogesh Raut.

31. Thus, it is claimed by the learned advocate for the accused that, on 29/05/2024 this accused was assaulted twice and accused in Crime No. 348/2024 are not relative of PW-4 Nilesh Raut. However, nothing is placed on record to support said claim so made by the learned advocate for the accused. Accused has filed copy of charge sheet so filed in Crime No. 348/2024 and same shows that, along with accused, Dayanand Raut, Yogesh Rait and PW-4 Nilesh Raut are also accused in said crime and said case is registered as R.C.C. No. 335/2025, which is pending before learned Judicial Magistrate First Class at Mohol.

32. Learned advocate for the accused pointed to the time of lodging of an FIR in said case, which is 7.56 p.m. on 29/05/2024, while time of lodging of FIR in the present case is 11.55 p.m. on 29/05/2024, i.e., four hours almost lodging of FIR by this accused in Mohol Police Station.

33. As per submissions of learned advocate for the accused, FIR in the present was lodged only to give counter blast to the FIR lodged by the accused and that, throughout the day, PW-1 Akshay, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh waited for this accused and when they saw that, he has lodged an FIR against this accused under Atrocities Act, he also pointed to the allegations in the FIR in R. C. C. No. 335/2025, wherein, it is clearly

mentioned that, accused Dayanand Raut therein has threatened him of lodging of false complaint under Atrocities Act.

34. It is settled rule that, accused shall raise his defence and no burden of proving any fact beyond doubt lies on him, however, he may establish his defence just by showing preponderance of probability. In the case in hand, if all the facts are considered together, then, they clearly show that, on one hand, it is claimed by PW-1 Akshay, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh that, incident in the present case took place near Indian Oil Petrol Pump of village Narkhed and time then was between 10.00 a.m. to 11.00 a.m. on 29/05/2024. While, charge sheet in R. C. C. No. 335/2025 clearly show time of taking place of incident in said case firstly at 10.00 a.m. of 29/05/2024 in the office of the accused at village Narkhed and thereafter, near agricultural land of one Kakasaheb Patil situated at Narkhed to Khandar road, where, he was assaulted again. Then, this accused went to the police station from where he was sent to the Rural Hospital and after taking treatment, he lodged an FIR at about 8.00 p.m. While, in the present case, the incident was over till 11.55 p.m. PW-1 Akshay, PW-3 Manoj and PW-4 Nilesh maintained complete silence and even their evidence do not disclose till that time, where they were and four hours after lodging of an FIR by this accused in Mohol police station, certainly PW-1 Akshay lodged an FIR under Atrocities Act with other offences under IPC against this accused.

35. Thus, defence so raised by the accused that, only to give counter blast to his case, FIR has been lodged against him appear to be more probable and inspires confidence. Already, it is observed herein before that, there are serious discrepancies in the version of all eye

witnesses and when they are considered with terrible delay of 12 hours so caused in lodging of an FIR, then, entire case of prosecution appears to be highly doubtful and raises a serious question, as to whether, incident as alleged has taken place or not. In view of such circumstances, it can not be said that, prosecution has discharged the burden beyond reasonable doubt. Hence, point No.3 is answered in the negative.

**As to points No. 1, 2 and 4 :-**

36. Elaborate findings have been recorded while deciding point No.3 and it is already observed and held that, entire case of the prosecution appear to be highly doubtful and seriously raises a question, as to whether, incident as alleged really taken place or not and therefore, it is also highly doubtful, whether as alleged, accused slapped and intentionally insulted PW-1 Akshay or not and therefore, prosecution also failed to discharge the burden beyond reasonable doubt. Since, the offence punishable under section 323 and 504 is not proved, question of offence punishable under section 3(2)(va) of the Atrocities Act getting proved do not arise at all. Hence, points No. 1, 2 and 4 are answered in the negative.

**As to point No. 5 :-**

37. Since, the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the guilt of the accused at home for the offences punishable under section 323 and 504 of IPC and Section 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Atrocities Act, accused is entitled to be acquitted. Hence, the following order is passed.

**ORDER**

- 1 Accused Chandrakant Maruti Mote is acquitted of the offences punishable under Section 323 and 504 of the Indian Penal Code,

**Judgment**

1860 and section 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, vide Section 235(1) of the Criminal Procedure Code.

- 2 Accused shall execute the bail bond of Rs.15,000/- (Rs. Fifteen Thousand) with a surety in like amount to appear before the Appellate Court as and when the Court issued notice in respect of appeal or petition against the judgment vide Section 437-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
- 3 The bail bond stand cancelled and surety be discharged.

Date : 13/03/2026

( Manoj S. Sharma )  
Special Judge, Solapur

**CERTIFICATE**

I affirm that, the contents of this PDF file Judgment are same word to word, as per the original order.

Name of the Court : Principal District & Sessions  
Court,Solapur.

Name of Stenographer : P. N. Kanaki

Judgment signed by the  
Presiding Officer on : 18/03/2026

Judgment uploaded on : 18/03/2026