



drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.77 OF 2024

Ritesh Bharat Tarfe

APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Another

RESPONDENTS

.....
Mr. Tushar C. Shinde, Advocate for the applicant
Mr. C. V. Bhadane, APP for respondent - State

.....
[CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]

DATE : 18th MARCH, 2024

ORDER :

1. Applicant apprehends arrest in Crime No. 400 of 2023 registered with Vimantal Police Station District - Nanded for offence punishable under sections 498-A and 306 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. FIR is lodged by Janabai Bhagwan Nandve, mother in law of applicant, alleging that her daughter Sujata was married to applicant in the year 2021. Applicant harassed Suraja to meet his unlawful demand of Rs.42,000/- for purchasing motorcycle and then for Rs.18,000/- for purchasing mobile phone. Again a demand for Rs.10,000/- was raised for rent. On 29th November, 2023, at about 9.30 a.m. Sujata called informant on cellphone of her son and informed that applicant is beating and ill-treating her. Informant tried to convince her. On the same day, they

received phone call that Sujata has committed suicide by hanging. Informant and her son, along with other relatives went to Nanded and reached residential house of applicant. The door was latched from inside. Thereafter police arrived and opened the latch. They saw that Sujata has hanged herself in kitchen with sari, leaving behind a suicide note.

3. Heard learned advocate for applicant and learned APP for the State. Perused the papers of investigation.

4. In the suicide note, deceased Sujata has stated that applicant is responsible for her suicide. Within three years of marriage Sujata is compelled to commit suicide. Statements of co-workers (nurses) working with deceased also show that she had disclosed them about the ill-treatment meted out to her by applicant and she had expressed that it has become unbearable.

5. Considering the seriousness of accusations levelled against applicant and his complicity in the present crime, his custody is necessary for effective investigation. Applicant is, therefore, not entitled for discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

6. Application is, therefore, rejected.

**[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI]
JUDGE**