



CNR No.MHTH01-003986-2026

Order below Exh.1 in Criminal Bail Application No. 1194/2026
Mahesh Kalyankumar Jadhav Vs. State of Maharashtra

This is an application filed by applicant/accused Mahesh Kalyankumar Jadhav for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS 2023), as he is apprehending his arrest on an accusation in Cr.No. 214/2026 registered with Nayanagar police station under Section 69, 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS, 2023).

2] A chart

A] CASE DETAILS	
FIR Number & Date	Cr.No. 214/2026 Date – 27.05.2026
Police Station, District & State	Nayanagar Police Station, Dist. Thane, Maharashtra.
Sections	Under Sections 69, 351(2) of BNS
Maximum Punishment	Imprisonment for 10 years.
B] CUSTODY & PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE	
Date of arrest	--
Total period of custody undergone	--

C] STATUS OF TRIAL	
Stage of Proceedings (Investigation/charge-sheet/ cognizance/ framing of charges/Trial)	Investigation
Total number of witnesses cited in the charge-sheet.	--
Number of prosecution witnesses examined.	--
D] CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS	
FIR No. & Police Station	--
Sections	--
Status (Pending / Acquitted / Convicted).	--
E] PREVIOUS BAIL APPLICATIONS	
Court	--
Case No	--
Outcome of case	--
F] COERCIVE PROCESSES	
Whether any Non-Bailable Warrant was issued.	--
Whether declared a proclaimed offender.	--

3] Perused application and say filed by the prosecution at Exh.06 and 12. Heard learned advocate for the applicant/accused, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the intervenor.

4] The learned counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that, as per allegations in the FIR first physical

relations between informant and accused had taken place on 02.11.2024. The informant and accused both are major. The physical relationship of the informant with accused was consensual. Custodial interrogation of applicant/accused is not necessary. Nothing required to be recovered or discovered at the instance of accused. without incriminating evidence, investigating officer likely to arrest applicant/accused. He is permanent resident of Pune. He is ready to co-operate in the investigation. He will not flee from justice. He is ready to abide the conditions. Hence urged for granting anticipatory bail.

5] The learned APP and learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that, accused contacted the informant through social media app, Instagram. Then he developed friendship with informant. Then proposed to marry with informant/victim and under promise to marry, by deceiving her maintained physical relations. Thereafter he continued his physical relations upto May 2025 and then refused to marry with informant/victim. The investigation is in progress. The applicant/accused has took video shooting in his mobile phone and snapped some photographs. Those are required to be recovered. The screen shots of the chat from the mobile phone of accused also required to be seized. Medical examined of accused is required to be conducted. Since registration of FIR he is hiding himself and not co-operating the investigating agency. There is possibility of fleeing the accused from justice. Possibility of committing similar

offences with other females cannot be ruled out. In that regard, investigation is required to be conducted. There is possibility of threatening informant and prosecution witnesses, tampering evidence. Hence, urged for rejecting application.

6] The learned counsel for the intervenor placed reliance on decision in case of **Jitendra Singh Baghel Vs. State of U.P. and another – 2025 AHC 12493** in which Hon'ble Allahabad High Court observed that,

“It is well settled that, where the promise to marry is false and the intention of maker at the time of making the promise itself was not to abide by it, but to deceive the woman to convince her to engage in sexual relations, there is a “misconception of facts” that vitiates the woman “consent” . The offence is heinous in nature. The charge sheet has also been filed under the Information Technology Act. Considering the over all facts and circumstance of the case as well as keeping in view the submissions advanced on behalf of parties, gravity of offence, role assigned to applicant and severity of punishment, I do not find any ground to release the applicant on bail”.

7] The facts in above cited case and present case are identical. At this stage the recitals of FIR and documents placed on record clearly demonstrates that, initially the applicant/accused contacted informant victim through social media app Instagram, developed friendship relations with her. Thereafter developed intimacy and under the promise to marry maintained physical relations with informant victim and then refused to marry

with her. It prima facie shows that, since inception the applicant accused has intention to deceive the informant/victim and convinced her for physical relations under promise to marry. The offence is heinous in nature. Hence in view of the ratio laid down in above cited case, it is not fit case to extend benefit of anticipatory bail. Hence I pass following order.

ORDER

1] The application is rejected.

Thane.

Date : 12.08.2026

Sd/-xxx

(B.D. Shelke)

Addl. Sessions Judge, Thane.

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this P. D.F. file of Judgment/order are same word for word as per original Judgment.

Name of the Steno	:- Shri. R. P Pawar, Grade -1
Name of the Court	:- Shri. B. D. Shelke, District Judge-1 and Addl. Sessions Judge, Thane.
Date of Judgment/order	:- 12.08.2026
Judgment/order signed by Presiding Officer on	:- 12.08.2026
Judgment/order uploaded on	:- 12.08.2026