



IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE, PANDHARPUR
Order Below Exh.1 in Criminal Bail Application No. 87/2026

CNR - MH50050002022026

Kailas Lasu Mayche

... Applicant/accused

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
(Through Police Station Officer
Karkamb Police Station vide
C.R. No. 342/2025)

... Respondent/State

Appearance

Mr. G. P. Patil, Ld. Advocate for the applicant / accused

Mr. S. S. Dulange, Ld. APP for the Respondent / State

(ORAL ORDER)

(Dictated and pronounced in the open Court)

This is an application filed by the applicant/accused for grant of regular bail under section 483 of BNSS, in connection with C.R.No. 342/2025 registered with Karkamb police station for the offence punishable under Sec. 103 (1) of BNS.

02. Applicant/accused submitted that, the FIR is based on suspicion. There is no eye witness to the alleged incident. The prosecution case is based on circumstantial evidence. The prosecution has failed to establish last seen circumstance. There is no recovery or discovery at the instance of the accused. The medical evidence is not conclusively linked to the accused. Investigation is substantially over.

The applicant is labour with no criminal antecedent. Trial will take considerable time. The prolonged incarceration would cause irreparable hardship to the applicant. Hence, he prayed for grant of regular bail in connection with C.R.No. 342/2025 registered with Karkamb police station.

03. Learned APP submitted reply at Exh. 4 and resisted the application on the ground that, offence is serious and punishable up to imprisonment for life. The accused No. 1 was arrested on 29.12.2025. During course of investigation the medical officer has conducted the P. M. dead body and medical officer gave advance cause death certificate that, "death due to cardio respiratory arrest due to blockage of upper airway track due to strangulation". The accused due to family dispute took suspicion on the character of deceased and he committed murder of deceased by strangulation with the help of scarf. If bail is granted to the applicant/accused, then he will put pressure on witnesses. He will also cause obstruction in the course of investigation. Lastly Ld. APP prayed for rejection of bail application.

04. I.O. submitted say at Exh. 5 and resisted application on the ground that, alleged offence is serious in nature. Investigation is in progress. The accused took suspicion on character of deceased and with the help of scarf he committed murder of deceased by strangulation. There is possibility of repetition of crime, if bail is granted to the accused. The accused is permanent resident of village Kirwad, Tal.

Sakhari, Dist. Dhule. If bail is granted to the accused, then he will not remain present before the Court. Lastly the I.O. prayed for rejection of application.

05. Heard learned advocate Shri. G. P. Patil for the applicant/accused and learned APP Shri. Dulange for the respondent state, at length.

06. Perused contents of this application and say filed by Ld. APP and I.O. By this application, applicant/accused prayed for grant of regular bail.

07. I have gone through F.I.R. In FIR name of applicant/accused is specifically mentioned. There are allegations against applicant/accused are that, applicant committed murder of deceased by strangulation and accused ran away from the spot of incident. Thus, in FIR there is specific allegation against applicant/accused that, he committed murder of deceased. The role of applicant/accused is specifically described in FIR and hence, he cannot be enlarged on bail.

08. In present case, investigation of crime has been completed and charge sheet has been filed against the accused. The Ld. Advocate for the applicant, filed on record the copy of charge sheet. I have gone through copy of charge sheet. There are statements of witnesses namely Meenabai Sonvane, Raj Mayche, Radhika Mayche, Mangalbai Sonvane

etc., who have specifically stated that, the accused committed murder of deceased by strangulation. The charge sheet shows that, the post mortem was conducted and P. M. report shows ligature marks around the neck of deceased. The P. M. report also shows that, the cause of death is due to strangulation. Thus, the medical report is also corroborative to the version of witnesses. Prima facie there is sufficient material on record to show the involvement of accused in the crime. Hence, he cannot be granted regular bail.

09. In present case, the alleged offence is serious in nature. It is punishable up to imprisonment for life or death. The woman is died. As per allegations, accused committed her murder. In such type of serious offence, it is not appropriate to grant regular bail to the accused.

10. Charge sheet shows that, the accused, complainant and witnesses reside in the same village. If bail is granted to the applicant/accused, then he may tamper prosecution witnesses. Hence, bail cannot be granted to the applicant accused.

11. Considering the nature of offence and role played by applicant/accused in the crime, in my view applicant is not entitled for grant of bail. Hence application needs to be rejected. Hence, I proceed to pass following order :

ORDER

1. Criminal Bail Application No. 87/2026 is rejected.
2. Bail Application No. 87 of 2026 is disposed off accordingly.

Date : 17.06.2026.

(A. S. Salgar)
Additional Sessions Judge, Pandharpur

CERTIFICATE

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

01. Name of the Stenographer - Santosh Vilas Ghongade.
02. Name of the Court - Court of Dist. Judge 03,
Pandhapur.
03. Order/judgment signed by P.O. on - 17.06.2026.
04. Order /Judgment uploaded on - 17.06.2026.