

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-,BARSHI,
DIST. SOLAPUR.**

(Presided over by R. S. Rote)



Criminal Bail Application No. 501/2026
Savita Baburao Mali(Raut) Vs. State.
(CNR.MHSO210009072026)

Order Passed Below Exh.1

1. Applicant **Savita Baburao Mali (Raut)** filed this application for regular bail under section 483 of B.N.S.S. in Crime No. 403/2026 registered at Tembhurni Police Station for the offence punishable under sections 80, 85, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. The applicant has reproduced contents of F.I.R. in this application. As per the contents of bail application and oral arguments it is the case of the applicant that, she is innocent and not committed any offence and falsely implicated in this case. There is no whisper against the applicant. The informant has not alleged that dowry was demanded or dowry was agreed in the marriage. Therefore, sec. 80 of BNS is not attracted. There is no suicide note or there is no instigation at the hands of applicant. Initially AD report was filed and in that AD report there was no allegation against the applicants. There is no recovery or discovery from the applicant therefore custodial interrogation is not required. Applicant will not abscond or tamper the prosecution

evidence. The applicant is ready to abide each and every condition. Therefore, bail application may be granted.

3. In support of her argument she has relied on the ruling in the case of (1) Aftab Alam Abdul Hamid Ansari Vs. State of Maharashtra; wherein it is observed that, “No evidence about cruelty on account of unlawful demand related to dowry, even if appellant wanted some money to set himself in business. It was nothing to do with dowry.”

(2) Appasaheb and other Vs. State of Maharashtra in Appeal (Cri) 1613 of 2005 in Hon’ble Supreme Court of India.

4. The learned A.P.P. and Investigating Officer have filed say and opposed the application. As per the say and oral argument it is the case of the prosecution that, there is strong and prima facie evidence against the present applicant. The offence is serious. If she released on bail she will not attend the Court and will abscond. She will tamper the evidence of prosecution. Therefore, application may be rejected.

5. In support of his argument he has relied on the ruling in the case of Lal Munnidevi Vs. State of Bihar; 2026(2) KARLR 6 wherein it is observed that “The Court must adopt a cautious approach and consider the presumption under sec. 140 while dealing with bail in cases of dowry death. Judiciary’s role in safeguarding public faith and addressing the grave social concern of dowry death. It is also observed that, “Need for deeper scrutiny in bail matters relating to dowry deaths mechanical approach by

High Courts undermines gravity of offence and public threat in judiciaries resolve to combat dowry death.”

6. Heard both sides at length. Perused report along with case papers. It prima facie appears that, Bandu Jagannath Nale lodged the report that he resides with his family. His daughter Vanita got married with Rohan Baburao Raut on 15.03.2026. After marriage applicant and others are illtreating and giving harassment to deceased Vanita on the count that, her father had not given anything in the marriage. Therefore, they are compelling her to bring Rs.2,00,000/- from parents to construct the house. They also saying that, “your father had not given gold ring in the month of Dhonda”. They illtreated and harassed to the deceased and instigated to commit suicide. Due to the harassment and cruelty deceased committed suicide on 08.06.2026 at about 9.00 am in the house of informant.

7. According to the applicant that, initially AD was reported and in the AD no any whisper about the dowry or illtreatment. Therefore, present FIR is falsely lodged to implicate applicant and others. It appears that, applicant has produced report (खबरी जबाब) dtd. 08.06.2026. It appears that, Bandu Jagannath Nale gave report that on 08.06.2026 at about 7.00 am he told deceased that, he is going to Shetphal to relatives for Raksha Visarjan after coming back he will come with her to leave her to matrimonial home. At about 9.00 am he came back. At that time his wife and son started shouting that, Vanita committed suicide. It appears

from the statement that there is no any allegation against the applicant or any other members in respect of dowry or cruelty. It appears on 11.06.2026 Bandu Jagannath Nale lodged report. Considering the AD report it appears that, there is no allegation against the applicant but in the report lodged dated 11.06.2026 there is specific allegation about illtreatment. It transpires that, marriage of deceased took place on 15.03.2026 and she committed suicide on 08.06.2026. This fact itself shows that deceased committed suicide within seven years from the date of marriage. According to the applicant that, allegations are false and to implicate the applicant informant lodged false complaint. Whether allegations in the report are false or true it will be decided on the merit at the time of final hearing. At this stage it is not required to decide merits of the case. While granting or rejecting the bail application it is required to see whether there is prima facie involvement of applicant in the alleged offence.

8. Admittedly deceased committed suicide within three months from the date of marriage. As per the report on 01.06.2026 deceased, her husband had come to the house of informant. At that time informant had given clothes(मानपान) to them. Thereafter on 05.06.2026 deceased came back to the house of informant. On 08.06.2026 informant told deceased that he will come to leave her in matrimonial home. If there was not any cause of returning deceased to maternal home then why informant will say that he will come with her. Considering the

record prima facie it appears involvement of applicant in the case
The offence is antisocial.

9. Considering the rulings cited on behalf of the applicant and APP it appears that, yet investigation is not completed. Charge sheet is not filed. The allegations leveled against the applicant is serious. Offence is serious. Therefore, it will be not proper to release the applicant on bail. Hence, present application deserves to be rejected. Resultantly, following order is passed.

ORDER

Regular bail application is rejected.

(Dictated and pronounced in open court).

Date : 07.08.2026

(R. S. Rote)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Barshi.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file Judgment/Order is same word to word as per the original Judgment/Order.

- (a) Name of the Stenographer : Sayyed N. I. (Grade-1)
- (b) Court : Ad hoc District Judge-1 &
Addl. Sessions Judge, Barshi.
- (c) Order dictated by P.O. on : 07.08.2026
- (d) Order signed by P.O. on : 07.08.2026
- (e) Order uploaded on : 07.08.2026