



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

932 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1804 OF 2025

VINOD ARUN SONAWANE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for applicant : Mr. Satej S. Jadhav
APP for the respondent – State : Mr. S.N. Morampalle
...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 9 DECEMBER 2025

PER COURT :

The applicant has approached this Court seeking regular bail in connection with FIR bearing Crime No. 161 of 2025 dated 23.05.2025 registered with Jalgaon Taluka Police Station, District - Jalgaon for the offences punishable under section 109, 74, 115(2), 351(2), 351(3), 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Heard learned counsel for both the sides. Perused the material available on record, including the chargesheet.

3. The FIR alleges that on 23.05.2025, when the complainant was sleeping on terrace of his house with his family, at about 1.30 am in midnight, he heard shouting by his niece Diksha. He saw present applicant running away. The victim - Diksha told that applicant outraged her modesty. Resultantly, the informant and his younger

brother with the victim girl went to applicant and questioned the reason, the accused assaulted the brother of informant on his stomach and right shoulder by a sharp edged weapon and tried to kill him. The applicant also absued and beat them with fist and kick blows.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant was arrested on 23.05.2025, investigation is complete and chargesheet has been filed. It is a case of love affair between applicant and the victim. Since the family members of the informant were against the same, therefore is falsely implicated in the aforesaid offence. There is delay in lodging the complaint. The alleged act of assault was not pre-meditated but was at the spur of the moment and without any intention.

5. Learned APP opposed the application. He submitted that the applicant has outraged the modesty of the victim. He has assaulted the brother of the informant, casuing grievous injuries. Injurty certificate at page 135 corroborates the same. There is every likelihood of tampering with the prosecution evidence. He, therefore, prayed to reject the bail application.

6. After having heard the respective sides and perusal of the material on record, including the chargesheet and the injury certificate, *prima facie*, appears the act of assault by the applicant was at the spur

of the moment, investigation is complete and chargesheet has been filed. Even the victim is discharged from hospital. No purpose would be served by continued incarceration of the applicant. The apprehension expressed by the learned APP, in relation to the tampering with the prosecution evidence, can be adequately taken care of, by imposing stringent conditions.

7. Resultantly, the following order is passed :-

ORDER

- (I) Application is allowed.
- II) Applicant – Vinod Arun Sonawane, be released on regular bail upon furnishing P.R. bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Fifty Thousand only) with one or two local solvent sureties in the like amount, in connection with Crime No. 161 of 2025 dated 23.05.2025 registered with Jalgaon Taluka Police Station, District - Jalgaon for the offences punishable under section 109, 74, 115(2), 351(2), 351(3), 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on the following conditions :-
 - (a) After his release from jail, the applicant shall report to the Investigating Officer, as and when called for in writing.
 - (b) The applicant shall attend the trial Court every month between 11.00 am to 1.00 pm. to mark his presence.
 - (c) Applicant shall co-operate with the conduct of trial and attend trial Court on all dates unless specifically exempted and will not take any unnecessary adjournment.
 - (d) The applicant shall not influence with any of the prosecution witnesses or tamper with the evidence, in any manner.

- (d) Before his actual release from jail, the applicant shall furnish his address where he propose to reside after his release from jail, to the concerned Police Station and also to the Trial Court.
- (f) In case of infraction of the above conditions and / or two consecutive defaults in marking his attendance before trial Court, it shall attract the provisions of Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C. i.e. for cancellation of bail.

8. Needless to state that the observations rendered herein-
above are to the extent of consideration of the bail application and trial
Judge may not get influenced by these observations and shall consider
the case on the basis of evidence on record and in accordance with
law.

[SACHIN S. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

arp/