

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 413 OF 2025**

Kalyani Subhash Kekan

...Applicant

Versus

Dinesh Madhukar Khedkar

...Respondents

Mr. Kunal Shirgire, i/by Mr. Vikas Kolekar for Applicant

Ms. S.M. Yadav for Respondent-State

A.P.I. Ganesh Jadhav, Deccan Police Station, present

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.

DATED: 03 DECEMBER 2025

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Kunal Shirgire, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Ms. Yadav, learned APP for the State.
2. By this application filed under Section 439(2) of Code of the Criminal Procedure, 1973, the Applicant who is the First Informant is seeking cancellation of bail granted by order dated 4th September, 2025 passed in Criminal Bail Application No.5747 of 2025, by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pune.
3. It is the submission of the learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant that the learned Additional Sessions Judge has recorded that in fact the First Informant had expressed that she was not willing to

marry with the Respondent No.1 and further that he could marry any other girl, however, thereafter, the said dispute was settled and Respondent No.1 agreed to marry with her immediately after getting Government service. He submits that the said aspect has not been taken into consideration by the the learned Additional Sessions Judge and therefore the impugned order is required to be quashed and set aside.

4. However, perusal of the record shows that the F.I.R. itself records that on 25th May, 2025, the parents and brother of the Respondent No.1 came to the residence of the Applicant for discussing the said marriage proposal and certain disputes took place and therefore, the family of the Respondent No.1 cancelled the said proposal. Thus, there is no substance in the contention raised by the learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant.

5. Mr. Shirgire, learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant has raised another contention that the Applicant is getting phone calls from some unknown numbers. However, there is nothing on record to show that the Respondent No.1 is contacting the Applicant.

6. Accordingly, no case is made out for cancellation of bail granted by order dated 4th September, 2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge in Criminal Bail Application No.5747 of 2025.

7. For the above reasons, Criminal Application is rejected.

8. Needless to observe that the observations made in this order also

in the said order dated 4th September, 2025 are prima facie observations and not to be take into consideration at the stage of trial.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]