



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1660 OF 2025

Firoj Babu Shaikh

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra

...

- Mr. Satej S. Jadhav, Advocate for Applicant
- Mr. V. M. Kagne, APP for Respondent - State

...

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.

DATED : 19.11.2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard Mr. Jadhav learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State.

2. The applicant has approached this Court seeking regular bail in connection with FIR bearing Crime No. 337 of 2024, dated 16.12.2024, registered with Dharashiv Rural Police Station, District – Dharashiv, for the offences punishable under Sections 108, 351(1) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Section 66(E) and 67 of the Information and Technology Act, 2000.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 19.11.2024, Snehal, wife of the complainant, aged 33 years, committed suicide by hanging. An FIR was lodged on 16.12.2024 alleging that the applicant had harassed the deceased and thereby abetted her suicide on account of

her alleged illicit relations with Firoz Babu Shaikh, the present applicant. It is the allegation of the complainant that accused No.1, Firoz, had taken obscene photographs and videos of the deceased and, on that basis, blackmailed her and repeatedly compelled her to have sexual relations with him against her will. It is further alleged that accused No.1 forwarded the said obscene photographs and videos of the deceased to accused No.2 – Arun Ramrao More. During a four-hour video call involving the deceased and her father, the deceased is stated to have spoken about her relationship with accused No.1 and the misuse of the photographs and videos. It is alleged that this harassment led her to commit suicide. The applicant was arrested, and the charge-sheet has been filed.

4. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the applicant that though the applicant is charged with the offence under Section 306 of the IPC, now Section 108 of the BNS, there is no evidence on record to show any instigation or provocation by the applicant in close proximity to the incident that led to the commission of suicide by the deceased. The learned counsel further submits that the co-accused, Arun More, has already been released on regular bail after filing of the charge-sheet, vide order dated 24.07.2025 in Bail Application No. 1087 of 2025. He, therefore, submits that on similar grounds, namely, that the investigation is complete and that there is

no likelihood of the applicant tampering with the prosecution evidence, the applicant deserves to be released on bail.

5. As against this, the learned APP strongly opposes the application on the ground that the applicant is responsible for the suicide of the victim, the wife of the complainant. It is submitted that there are serious allegations of an illicit relationship between the applicant and the deceased, which allegedly drove her to commit suicide. There are several call records showing frequent communication between the applicant and the deceased, corroborating the alleged relationship. The learned APP further submits that the statement of witness Pankaj Bhalerao sheds light on the relationship between the applicant and the deceased. The Investigating Officer has also recorded the statement of the said witness under Section 183 of the BNS, which corroborates his earlier statement. He, therefore, submits that even though the investigation is complete, this is not a fit case for grant of regular bail.

6. I have gone through the charge-sheet filed along with the present application, including the statements of the complainant as well as the father of the victim, Santosh Repad. A perusal of the statement of Santosh shows that on the intervening night of 18.11.2024 and 19.11.2024, there were exchanges of calls between the father of the victim, Snehal, and her father-in-law, Saudagar

Mohite, during which the victim was questioned about her relationship with the present applicant, Firoj. The statement further reveals that the victim had admitted to her illicit relationship with the applicant. It is also stated by Santosh Repad that immediately thereafter, Saudagar Mohite, father-in-law of the deceased, informed him that she had committed suicide. Thus, it appears that there is a limited and indirect role of the applicant; however, any observations made by this Court are prima facie and shall not affect proceedings before any other Court.

7. Considering the nature of the evidence presently available against the applicant, I am inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the applicant by releasing him on regular bail. Hence, the following order:-

ORDER

- i. The application is allowed.
- ii. Applicant – *Firoj Babu Shaikh*, be released on regular bail on furnishing PR. bond of Rs. 50,000/- (Fifty Thousand Only) with one or two local solvent sureties in the like amount, in connection with FIR bearing Crime No. 337 of 2024, dated 16.12.2024, registered with Dharashiv Rural Police Station, District – Dharashiv, for the offences punishable under Sections 108, 351(1) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Section 66(E) and 67 of the Information and Technology Act, 2000, on the following

conditions :-

- (a) The applicant shall not leave the jurisdiction of District Dharashiv without leave of the learned Trial Court.
- (b) The applicant, upon being released on bail, shall not contact the informant, in any manner whatsoever, during the pendency of the trial.
- (c) The applicant shall co-operate with the trial Court and he shall attend each and every date, unless exempted by the trial Court.
- (d) The applicant shall not tamper with the evidence of the prosecution and he shall not influence the informant, witnesses and other persons concerned with the case.
- (e) The applicant, upon being released on bail, shall place on record of the trial Court the details of his Contact Number and residential address with updates in case of any change.

8. Needless to say, in case of violation of any of the aforesaid conditions, the bail granted to the applicant shall be liable to be cancelled.

9. It is also clarified that the observations made in this order are limited to the disposal of the present bail application. The concerned Court shall proceed further in the matter without being influenced by the observations made hereinabove.

10. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.)