

MHST010003822026



**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, SATARA.  
Criminal Bail Application No. 62 of 2026**

**Pravin Shivaji Adsul.**

**..Applicant.**

**V/s.**

**State of Maharashtra**

**..Respondent**

Mr. K. V. Jadhav, Advocate for the applicant.

Ms. G. M. Lakade, Addl. PP for the State.

**Coram: Mr. S. R. Tamboli,  
The Addl. Sessions Judge, Satara,**

**::ORDER BELOW EXH.1::**

1. In the instant application, the applicant has prayed for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S.
2. In brief, the case of the prosecution is that in June 2015, accused Komal married to Amol Laxman Jadhav, who was serving in the Police Department. Komal was allegedly having an extramarital affair. Due to this, Amol was under mental stress. He disclosed this fact to Sachin Jadhav, the informant. The informant, his parents, Amol, and others went to the house of Komal's parents on 12.04.2025. However, they were not present at home and did not answer their phone calls. Thereafter, Amol informed the informant over the phone that Komal was not allowing him to meet his son and that he would commit suicide by hanging himself from a fan. The

informant disclosed this fact to Komal through a video call. At that time, Pravin, the brother of Komal, told Amol to commit suicide. Amol informed the informant that he would commit suicide in the house of Komal's parents. On 16.04.2025, Komal registered an offence against Amol. Komal, Pravin, Shivaji, Sourabh, and Vivek demanded an amount of Rs. 20,00,000/- for withdrawing the case filed by Komal and threatened Amol with dismissal from service. On 21.05.2025, Komal informed Sushant Bankar that Amol would commit suicide. Sushant informed the said fact to the informant. Amol sent a chit via WhatsApp to Sushant, stating that he would commit suicide on account of the demand of Rs. 20,00,000/-. On 22.05.2025, Amol committed suicide.

3. In the backdrop of these facts, Mr. K. V. Jadhav, learned counsel for the applicant, submitted that the applicant has not played any role in the commission of the offence and did not instigate the deceased to commit suicide. The deceased might have been under pressure due to matrimonial discord. This Court has already released co-accused Komal Jadhav on bail. At the relevant time, the applicant was abroad and had no concern with the offence. There is no prima facie case against the applicant. The applicant has a permanent residence and is ready to abide by all conditions imposed by the Court. Hence, he prayed that the applicant be released on bail.

4. Per contra, Ms. G. M. Lakade, learned Addl. P.P. for the State, submitted that the Investigating Officer has to seize the mobile phone from the applicant. The applicant was aware of the alleged love affair of the co-accused. The sister of the applicant was married to the deceased. The applicant had taken part in settling the dispute between the deceased and his sister. The applicant had allegedly

made various video calls to the deceased and abetted him to commit suicide. The applicant is residing abroad and allegedly abetted the deceased to commit suicide from abroad. There is a prima facie case against the applicant. Custodial interrogation of the accused is necessary. Hence, she prayed that the application be dismissed.

5. In the present case, the police have filed a charge-sheet against the co-accused. The suicide note of the deceased does not refer to the video call mentioned in the FIR. The suicide note is silent regarding the involvement of the applicant in the crime. Ad-interim anticipatory bail was granted to the applicant. The prosecution has not alleged that he has misused the liberty. It is also not the case of the prosecution that he has not cooperated in the investigation. As earlier stated, the suicide note of the deceased does not show the involvement of the applicant in the crime. The allegation of the informant regarding the video call is vague. There is no prima facie case that the applicant abetted the deceased to commit suicide. There is no justification for the arrest of the applicant. He was residing abroad. In case the mobile phone is required, the Investigating Officer can direct the applicant to produce it. The applicant has a permanent residence. It is less likely that he will abscond. The apprehension of tampering with the evidence can be addressed by imposing stringent conditions. Hence, I am inclined to grant bail. In the result, I pass the following order.

### **ORDER**

1. The application is allowed.
2. Anticipatory bail is granted to Applicant Pravin Shivaji Adsul in Crime No. 485/2025, Satara City Police Station, registered for the

offences punishable under Sections 108 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, and in case of his arrest in the said offence, he be released on furnishing his P.B. & S.B. of Rs.50,000/- on following conditions.

- (a) Applicant not to pressurize the witnesses and not to tamper the prosecution evidence.
  - (b) Applicant shall attend the concerned police station as and when called by the I.O.
  - (c) Applicant and his surety if any, shall furnish their addresses and the mobile numbers and shall not change their residence till conclusion of the trial without informing to the concerned police station.
3. Issue intimation of the order to the concerned police station.

Place : Satara.  
Date : 10.03.2026.

(S.R. Tamboli)  
Additional Sessions Judge,  
Satara.