

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**Bail Application No. 1423 of 2025**

Ranjana Uttam Chaughule  
Age 52, Occ: Housewife,  
R/o- Pokharkar Nagar,  
Datta Nagar, Chinchwad,  
Pune.

... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra  
Through Pimpri Police Station  
Vide C.R. No.387 of 2024.

...Respondent

**With**

**Criminal Bail Application No. 1474 of 2025**

Renuka Maruti Pawar  
Age 36 years, Occ: Household,  
R/o. Near Datta Mandir, Datta  
Nagar, Pimpri, Pune.  
(At present Yerwada Prison)

... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra  
At the instance of Pimpri  
Police Station, Pimpri.  
(Vide CR No.387 of 2024)

...Respondent

----

Mr Kuldeep Nikam, for the applicant in BA/1423/2025.

Mr Amol Patil, for the applicant in BA/1474/2025.

Mr SV Walve, APP, for respondent / State.

API MT Shinde, Pimpri Police Station, Pimpri-Chinchwad.

----

**Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.**

**Date: 23 December 2025**

**P.C.:**

Heard Mr Amol Patil and Mr Kuldeep Nikam, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants, and Mr SV Walve, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/ State.

2. By these applications, the applicants seek bail in connection with CR No.387 of 2024, registered at Pimpri Police Station, Pune, for offences punishable under Sections 302, 143, 147 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, and Sections 3(1)(i)(ii) and 3(4) of the Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on 21 April 2024, motivated by resentment towards Suresh's romantic relationship with Sonam, the applicants, along with the co-accused, formed an unlawful assembly and assaulted Suresh, using fists, kicks, and a waist belt, thereby inflicting injuries. Suresh was subsequently taken to the hospital, where he later succumbed to his injuries sustained during the attack.

4. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the

applicants, asserting the applicants' innocence, jointly submit that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the crime. It is contended that the accusations levelled against the applicants are vague and lack specificity. Specifically, no role has been ascribed to the applicant-Ranjana, and the sole allegation against the applicant-Renuka, is that she allegedly slapped the deceased, an incident which allegedly occurred in the afternoon, whereas the alleged murder of Suresh, the deceased, occurred in the evening. Furthermore, the use of a weapon has not been attributed to the applicants, nor do the eyewitnesses implicate them in the commission of the crime. The infliction of injuries to the deceased is, instead, attributed to the co-accused. The provisions of the MCOC Act are not applicable to the applicants.

5. It is further submitted that applicant-Ranjana was arrested on 23 April 2024, and applicant-Renuka was arrested on 17 July 2024. The investigation has concluded, and there is nothing to be recovered or discovered from the applicants, who have been incarcerated without any substantial progress in the trial. The applicants have no criminal antecedents and are prepared to comply with any conditions that this Court may deem appropriate to impose.

6. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/ State, opposes the applicant's request for bail. He submits that the applicants, along with the co-accused, formed an unlawful assembly and, in a brazen act of violence, launched an attack on the deceased. They assaulted him with punches, kicks, and a waist belt, causing fatal injuries. The offence is grave and serious. The learned APP raises concerns about granting bail to the applicants, as they may tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses.

7. This Court has given anxious consideration to the rival contentions canvassed across the Bar and perused the records.

8. Upon perusing the records, more particularly the CCTV footage of Aishwarya Hotel and Vidyanagar, it appears that the applicants were not present at the relevant time. The statements of the eyewitnesses do not implicate the applicants. Notably, the statement of Sonam, the daughter of the applicant-Renuka, reveals that after finding out about the romantic relationship between Sonam and the deceased, while the co-accused assaulted him with fist and kick blows, the applicant-Renuka slapped the deceased. This incident occurred in the afternoon, and thereafter, everyone left the spot. Thereafter, the applicant-

Renuka and Sonam returned home. She further narrates that the co-accused later brought the deceased to the residence of the applicant-Renuka, who immediately took him to the hospital. Her statement implicates the co-accused, not the applicants. The weapon allegedly used in the crime has been recovered from the co-accused, not from the applicants. The applicants are women with no criminal antecedents, and have been languishing in jail for a considerable period; however, the charges have not yet been framed. The prosecution's apprehensions about evidence tampering and witness influence can be addressed by imposing appropriate conditions.

9. In the totality of the circumstances, including the absence of any direct material connecting the applicants with the commission of the alleged crime, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the applicants. Hence, the following order:

**ORDER**

(i) The applicants shall be released on bail in CR No.387 of 2024, registered at Pimpri Police Station, Pune, upon executing a PR Bond of Rs.25,000/- each and furnishing one or more sureties in the like amount.

(ii) The applicants, themselves or

through any other person, shall not tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses.

(iii) The applicants shall regularly attend and cooperate with the trial Court for the expeditious disposal of the case.

10. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

**[R.N. Laddha, J.]**