

MHST210002012026



IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, PHALTAN.

Criminal Bail Application No. 85 of 2026

Vinayak Balaso JadhavApplicant

V/s.

State of MaharashtraRespondent

Mr. S. M. Saste, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr. V. H. Katkar Addl. P.P. for the State.

**Coram: Mr. S. R. Tamboli,
I/c The Addl. Sessions Judge, Phaltan,**

::ORDER BELOW EXH.1::

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

02. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 11.02.2026 the informant was contacted on WhatsApp by a woman identifying herself as "Prachi," who, after gaining his confidence through repeated calls and conversations, lured him to meet her at Phaltan on the pretext of a personal meeting. On 13.02.2026, she

(Page No.1)

met the informant at the Phaltan S.T. stand and induced him to follow her to a flat at Budhwar Peth, where, while they were talking, two unknown associates suddenly entered, questioned and intimidated him, and, along with three others waiting downstairs, forcibly took him to a secluded place near Phaltan airport. There, Prachi and her accomplices jointly abused, assaulted, and threatened the informant with a false rape case, thereby extorting money from him. One associate snatched his mobile phone, while others compelled him to accompany them on motorcycles and withdraw money from various ATMs, amounting to Rs.20,000/-, and also facilitated a fraudulent transaction of Rs.60,000/- through his credit card at a mobile shop. Additionally, a person using mobile number 9494127171, identified as "Raju Boke" through a payment scanner, demanded further payment, indicating coordinated involvement in the extortion. Under fear and coercion, the informant also handed over Rs.1,15,000/- in cash. After deleting the WhatsApp chats to destroy evidence, the accused persons returned his phone and dropped him near his vehicle. Subsequently, at about 9:00 p.m., two other associates intercepted the informant's car, assaulted him, and forcibly removed, a gold chain weighing approximately 200 grams from his neck before fleeing. Thus, the accused persons, acting in concert, executed a pre-planned scheme involving deceit by Prachi, physical intimidation by her accomplices, and coordinated extortion and robbery, resulting in wrongful loss to the informant to the extent of Rs.31,95,000/-.

03. In the backdrop of these facts, Mr. S. M. Saste, learned counsel for the applicant, submitted that the only allegation against the applicant is that he extorted the alleged amount from the informant. However, the informant has not identified the applicant. The informant has filed an affidavit stating that the name of the applicant has been included at the instance of the police. It is submitted that the applicant was not involved in the offence. It is further submitted that this Court has already released a co-accused on bail; therefore, the principle of parity is applicable to the case of the applicant. The applicant is having a permanent residence. Hence, he prayed that the applicant be released on bail.

04. Per contra, Mr. V. H. Katkar, learned A.P.P. for the State, submitted that the applicant was involved in a conspiracy in extorting the ransom amount and committed theft of a gold chain. The applicant was seen in CCTV footage along with the complainant, and an amount of Rs. 60,000/- was transferred to his account. Subsequently, the said amount was returned to the account of the informant. There is a prima facie case against the applicant. Hence, he prayed for rejection of the application.

05. The informant filed a say at Exh. 12 and did not object to the application.

06. In the present case, the charge-sheet is filed. The name of the applicant is mentioned in the FIR. However, the applicant

has not been identified in the T.I. Parade. He has also filed say which shows that he is not involved in the offence. No doubt, there is CCTV footage showing that the informant transferred the amount through a credit card. At this stage, it prima facie appears that no incident occurred as alleged at that time as the informant has not identified the applicant. Therefore, there is no prima facie case against the applicant. The say of the Investigating Officer does not show that the applicant has criminal antecedents. The trial will take its own time. No purpose will be served by detaining the applicant in jail. The applicant has a permanent residence, and it is less likely that he will abscond. The apprehension regarding tampering with evidence can be 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, Vinayak Balaso Jadhav, in connection with Phaltan City Police Station C.R. No. 44/2026, be released on bail on furnishing a P.R. bond and one or more 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 sureties shall furnish their residential addresses and mobile numbers and shall not change the same without prior intimation to the Investigating Officer.

3] The order be communicated to the concerned Jail by e-mail.

Date- 04/06/2026

**(S.R.Tamboli)
I/c. Addl. Sessions Judge, Phaltan**