



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 675 OF 2025

MURLIDHAR RAMKRUSHNA PADWAL

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Shri Shermale K. N., Advocate for the Appellant.

Shri Sunil B. Jadhav, APP for Respondent No.1/State.

Shri Suraj Mantri (appointed), Advocate for Respondent No.2.

...

CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.

DATE : 04 October, 2025

P. C. :-

1. By this appeal, the appellant is praying for grant of regular bail in Crime bearing FIR No.182/2025 registered on 11.06.2025 with Ghargaon Police Station, District Ahilyanagar for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 109, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, 'the Atrocities Act').

2. On 11.06.2025, the said FIR came to be lodged by respondent No.2/ informant stating therein that on 10.06.2025 at about 06:30 pm in evening, his sister-in-law Rupali (deceased) had gone to agricultural field belonging to the appellant

(Murlidhar Padwal) to answer nature's call and on that count, quarrel took place between two families. Thereafter, at about 08:00 pm in evening, the informant along with his relatives had gone to the house of the appellant (Murlidhar) and though they apologized for the said act of deceased Rupali, the appellant is alleged to have abused them by referring to their caste. At that time, accused No.2 (Vikram) went inside house and brought knife whereas, accused No.3 (Alka) caught hold the hands of deceased Rupali and accused No.2 (Vikram) is alleged to have assaulted her. When the informant's sister Monika was trying to save Rupali, accused No.2 also assaulted Monika. Due to said assault, Rupali and Monika got injured and were initially taken to Medico Hospital at Sangamner and thereafter, they were referred for further treatment to Pravara Medical College and Hospital at Loni. However, on 11.06.2025 at about 12:30 in night, injured Rupali succumbed to her injury. On the basis of these allegations, the said FIR came to be registered.

3. The accused were arrested on 11.06.2025. The appellant filed Criminal Bail Application No.314/2025 before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangamner, for regular bail.

However, the said bail application has been rejected vide order dated 20.08.2025. Hence, this appeal for regular bail.

4. Learned advocate for the appellant submits that no specific act of assault is attributed to the appellant. Even if allegations in the FIR are taken to its face value, at the most it can be said that the appellant has abused and threatened the victims. The appellant is arrested on the day of registration of FIR i.e. 11.06.2025 and since then, he is behind bars. Since investigation in the crime is already over, custody of the appellant is not at all required. He, therefore, prayed for releasing the appellant on regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned APP opposes the instant appeal and states that the appellant is involved in serious crime. There are eyewitnesses to the incident, who have attributed specific role to the appellant. As such, the appellant should not be released on regular bail.

6. I have also heard learned advocate for respondent No.2, who strongly opposes the instant appeal. He submits that the appellant does not deserve any leniency as the victims had gone to the accused to apologize and they were not armed. It was

not expected from the accused persons to assault the deceased. He also strongly argued that the assault is on ladies and it is at the behest of the appellant. As such, the appellant has committed very serious crime. If he is released on bail, he may pressurize witnesses and informant. Therefore, the appellant is not entitled for grant of regular bail.

7. After having heard the learned advocates for the respective parties and after going through material available on record, it is seen that the appellant is aged about 67 years and he is in jail since 11.06.2025. Investigation in the instant crime is already over. The main act of assault is attributed to the main accused Vikram, who is in jail. There are no criminal antecedents against the appellant. Apprehension expressed by learned advocate for respondent No.2 that the appellant, if released, would threaten or pressurize the witnesses and informant, can be taken care of by imposing stringent conditions.

8. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the case for grant of regular bail to the appellant is made out. Therefore, the instant appeal deserves to be allowed by granting regular bail to the appellant on certain conditions. Hence, the

following order:

ORDER

- a) The Criminal Appeal stands allowed.
- b) The impugned order dated 20.08.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge is quashed and set aside.
- c) In connection with Crime bearing FIR No.182/2025 registered on 11.06.2025 with Ghargaon Police Station, District Ahilyanagar for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 109, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, the appellant shall be released on furnishing PR bond of Rs.25,000/- [Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only] with one solvent surety/ security in the like amount.
- d) The appellant shall attend the concerned police station as and when called by the Investigating Officer till completion of trial and shall also attend on the dates as are fixed by the learned Sessions Court.
- e) The appellant shall not try to contact or pressurize the witnesses or the informant, in any manner whatsoever.

f) The appellant shall not enter village Karjule Pathar, Taluka Sangamner, District Ahilyanagar, till conclusion of the trial and he shall give his residential address to the concerned Investigating Officer.

9. Learned advocate Shri Suraj Mantri is appointed through High Court Legal Aid Services Sub Committee, to represent respondent No.2/ informant. After thoroughly preparing, he has conducted the matter and strongly opposed the appeal. His fees be quantified and paid to him as per rules.

10. However, it is made clear that the observations made in this order are *prima facie* in nature for the purpose of adjudication of this appeal.