



Special Case No.147/2024

State of Maharashtra

...Applicant

V/s.

Satish Ramchandra @ Ramdas Rakshe ...Accused

ORDER BELOW EXH.26

By this application, the State is seeking for cancellation of bail granted to accused no.1 Satish Ramchandra Rakshe.

2. It is contended that the accused no.1 has been released on bail and while granting bail a condition was imposed that he shall not tamper the prosecution evidence and shall assist the Investigating Officer when required. Allegedly, the said condition has been breached by accused no.1. Accused no.1 has abused witness namely; Rahul Jayhind Jadhav. N.C.No.485/2025 is registered in that regard. On that count contending that accused no.1 has misused the liberty, the State has prayed to cancel his bail.

3. Accused no.1 has filed reply at Exh.31 contending that he has not committed breach of any of the conditions of bail. Allegedly, the application has been filed to harass the accused no.1 as he is serving in Indian Army. The witness named; Rahul Jadhav is resident of Pune. Thus, contending that the contentions in the application are incorrect, accused no.1 has prayed to reject the application.

4. I have heard Ld. P.P. Shri.A.R.Kulkarni for the State and Ld. Advocate Shri.A.R.Katkar for accused no.1.

5. Along with instant application, N.C.R. have been filed. The N.C.R. are dated 10.08.2025 and 30.10.2025. The accused no.1 was enlarged on bail on 18.02.2025. Thus, apparently the N.C.R. are subsequent. Both the N.C.R. are filed by Rahul Jayhind Jadhav. The Ld. A.P.P. submitted that with reference to the present case, the accused no.1 had threatened Rahul Jadhav and hence there is breach of condition of bail. While Ld. Advocate for the accused submitted that there is no breach of condition of bail since no such condition as contended by State was imposed.

6. On perusal of bail order dated 18.02.2025, the material condition reads, "They shall not tamper the evidence of prosecution and shall assist the Investigating Officer as and when required by him". This condition mandates cooperation in investigation and non-tampering of evidence. To be specific, it does not speak of restraining the applicant/accused from threatening or pressurizing the witnesses. However, if no such condition is there, nobody gets a license to threaten the witnesses. If accused does so, it would be unrelated to the conditions giving independent right of action to the concerned person. Thus, the fact remains that there are no allegations that accused no.1 tampered any prosecution evidence or kept himself away from assisting the Investigating Officer. The contents of N.C.R. indicate that when Rahul Jadhav was ploughing the field, there was quarrel on the count that he took the tractor in the field of accused. Thus, this quarrel has no connection to the present crime. The second N.C.R. relates to similar incident of Rahul Jadhav proceeding in the field. Merely, the words as, "साक्ष देतोस काय", has no relation to the present crime. Moreover, it is not brought to the notice of the Court as to how it would relate to present crime. No affidavit of said witness Rahul

Jadhav is filed on record. An independent application was made by Rahul Jadhav before Witness Protection Committee and the incident mentioned therein is different, therefore, the same cannot be mingled in this application. It can be seen independently.

7. In the given situation, I do not find any merit in the application at Exh.26 regarding alleged breach of condition. Therefore, the application has to be disposed off as dismissed. Hence the order

ORDER

Application (Exh.26) is dismissed.

[Dictated and pronounced in Open Court]

Satara
Date : 09.06.2026.

(N.M.Jamadar)
Special Judge (Atrocity) Satara.