



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) No.421 OF 2026

(Sahadeo Shankarrao Palaspagar Vs. State of Maharashtra, through PSO, Yevada, Tq.
Daryapur, Distt. Amravati)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. D.N. Mudgale with Mr. Vikram Sarvatkar, Advocate for appellant.
Mrs. M.R. Kavimandan, APP for respondent.

CORAM : **PRAVIN S. PATIL, J.**

DATE : **11th JUNE, 2026.**

1. This Court by an order dated 26th May, 2026 made specific observation in para 3 and 4 as under :

“3. The contention is that the offence was initially registered against the applicant for the aforesaid offences i.e. Section 117(2) and 352 of BNS, 2023. Based on the allegations made by the complainant Smt. Sheela Bandu Palaspagar, the contention was that there was a quarrel which took place between the applicant and the complainant's husband over the reason of parking a vehicle, and they had a conversation and the accused pushed the husband of the complainant and he fell down. On the basis of such allegation, the aforesaid FIR was registered.

4. The complainant in the FIR itself has stated that on the said day, there was no injury to the deceased i.e. her husband Bandu Palaspagar, and therefore she had taken him to the residence. However, after the registration of the aforesaid FIR, the husband of the complainant expired on 17.04.2026 and

offence under Section 105 of the BNS, 2023 was subsequently added against the present applicant. On the basis of such offence being added, the learned Sessions Court has rejected the application on the ground that the offence is serious; however, the fact remains that on 25.02.2026, when the incident had occurred, even as per the complainant, the deceased Bandu Palaspar had not suffered any injury, and therefore, instead of taking him to hospital, she had taken him to her residence.”

2. This Court while granting ad-interim protection to the present applicant has laid down certain conditions and one of the conditions was that the applicant should attend the Police Station on every Monday between 11.00 a.m. and 4.00 p.m. Accordingly, the applicant attended the Police Station and co-operated in the investigation.
3. Learned A.P.P. did not dispute the fact that the applicant attended the Police Station and co-operating in the investigation.
4. In view of this, the application is allowed in terms of order passed by this Court dated 26th May, 2026.
5. It is made clear that all the conditions incorporated in the order dated 26th May, 2026 shall be followed by the applicant till filing of the charge-sheet.
6. Application stands disposed of.

(PRAVIN S. PATIL, J.)