

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1493 OF 2021**

Sachin Prabhakar Kulkarni .. Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra .. Respondent

...

Mr. Pandit Kasar i/b Vis Legis Law Practice for the Applicant.

Ms. A.A. Takalkar, A.P.P. for the State.

...

CORAM : SMT. BHARATI DANGRE, J.

DATED : 07TH JULY, 2021.

P.C:-

1. The Applicant, the husband of one Vrushali Kulkarni, who committed suicide, resulting into registration of C.R. No.120 of 2021 invoking Sections 306 and 323 of the IPC on the complaint filed by Vrushali's brother, seeks his release on bail, in anticipation of his arrest.

2. The Complainant, the brother of deceased Vrushali, has stated that the marriage of the Applicant with the deceased was solemnized 13 years back and twins were born out of the said wedlock after six years of marriage, but the Applicant was suspecting the fidelity of Vrushali and, on that count, used to

physically and mentally harass her. The instances of harassment and the manner in which she was subjected to cruelty is narrated by the brother in the complaint. On 17-19/02/2021, when she visited her parental house, she was found to be under tremendous mental pressure and she divulged to the Complainant that her husband was abusive towards her and exhibited savagery. She left for her matrimonial home, but was constantly in touch with her mother. On 27/02/2021, when she was talking to her mother, she reported that there was a camera fixed in her bedroom. The incident of harassment, physical and mental, ultimately resulted in the deceased committing suicide on 28/02/2021 and the Applicant is alleged to have abetted the said suicide. A suicide note is also found on the person of the deceased, where she has narrated her woes and speak of the brutality, attributing it to the Applicant.

3. In the light of the aforesaid contents of the complaint, where the wife holds the husband, the Applicant, responsible for the extreme step taken by her, the custodial interrogation of the Applicant is very much warranted and merely because he has two young children, to be looked after, is no ground to deny the custody of the Applicant to the Investigating Officer. The Application, therefore, deserves a rejection and, is accordingly, rejected.

[SMT. BHARATI DANGRE, J.]