

MHST010010262026



**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, SATARA
Criminal Bail Application No.239 of 2026**

Sahil Raju Jadhav

..Applicant

V/s.

State of Maharashtra

..Respondent

Mr. S.H. Panhale, Advocate for applicant.

Smt. A.S. Nimbalkar, Addl. PP. for the State.

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

:: ORDER BELOW EXH. 1 ::

1. In the present application, the applicant has prayed for bail under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. In short, the case of the prosecution, as per the FIR, is that on 21/02/2026, a marriage procession was being held for Girish, the brother of Rahul Mane, the informant. accused Sanket Jadhav brought his motorcycle into the procession at a high speed. The informant tried to persuade him, but he was not willing to listen. The informant then told him in a loud voice to leave the place. At that time, Sanket threatened to kill him. Thereafter, while the informant was driving his rickshaw, accused Sanket again

threatened him. However, the informant paid no heed to the threat. On 16/05/2026, while the informant was driving his rickshaw near Koregaon MIDC, accused Sanket came from behind on a motorcycle and intercepted the rickshaw. He was armed with a sickle and threatened to kill the informant. He raised the sickle towards him, whereupon the informant pushed him away and drove home in his rickshaw. On 21/05/2026, at about 7:00 p.m., Rohit Mane called the informant out of his house. When the informant went near the Government Godown, Sanket Jadhav, Sahil Jadhav, Rohit Mane, and Mayur Shingate came there. Sanket was armed with a sickle, Rohit with a stick, and Sahil with an iron rod. When the informant attempted to flee, Sahil and Mayur caught hold of him and caused him to fall to the ground. Sanket threatened to kill him and assaulted him on the head with the sickle, causing a bleeding injury. Thereafter, all of them placed him on a scooty. Sanket drove the scooty and Sahil also sat on it. They took him to Ekambe Road, while Rohit and Mayur followed on a motorcycle. At that place, Sahil assaulted him with an iron rod, Rohit assaulted him with a stick, and Mayur assaulted him with fist and kick blows. Sanket again threatened to kill him and his family members.

3. In the backdrop of these facts, Mr. S.H. Panhale, learned counsel for the applicant, submitted that there is no material on record to prove the injuries sustained by the informant. Had the applicant intended to cause the death of the informant, he would have assaulted him with a sharp-edged weapon, and the informant would have sustained corresponding

injuries. There is no prima facie case for the offence punishable under section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. The applicant is a young man and has a permanent residence. Hence, he prayed that the applicant be released on bail.

4. Per contra, Smt. A.S. Nimbalkar, learned Addl. P.P. for the state, submitted that the applicant conspired with the co-accused to murder the informant. The applicant assaulted the informant with an iron rod. The applicant and the co-accused reside in the same locality. The sickle has not yet been seized. There is a possibility of repetition of the offence. The applicant may tamper with the evidence. Hence, she prayed that the application be rejected.

5. The prosecution has not produced the injury certificate to ascertain the injuries sustained by the informant. The nature and extent of the injuries could have been determined on the basis of the injury certificate. However, no such injury certificate has been produced on record. The injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Criminal antecedents alone are not a sufficient ground for denial of bail. There are no allegations that the applicant assaulted the informant on any vital part of the body. Hence, there is no prima facie case for the offence punishable under section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

6. The investigation and trial will take their own course and are likely to consume considerable time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the applicant in jail by way of pre-

trial punishment. The muddemal property has already been recovered. Nothing remains to be recovered from the applicant. He has a permanent residence and is, therefore, not likely to abscond. The apprehension of tampering with the evidence can be adequately addressed by imposing stringent conditions. Hence, I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant. As a result, I pass the following order:

ORDER

1. The application is allowed.
2. The applicant, Sahil Raju Jadhav, be released on bail in connection with Koregaon Police Station C.R. No. 181/2026, on furnishing a P.R. bond and one or more solvent sureties in the sum of Rs. 50,000/-, subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat, or promise to any witness and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence.
 - (b) The applicant shall attend the concerned police station as and when called by the investigating officer.
 - (c) The applicant and his surety shall furnish their residential addresses and mobile numbers and shall not change the same without prior intimation to the investigating officer.
3. The applicant shall furnish bail before the concerned court.
4. A copy of this order be sent to the District Central Jail, Satara, by e-mail.

Date- 17/07/2026.

(S.R.Tamboli)
2nd Addl. Sessions Judge, Satara.