

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

**Bail Application No.3805 of 2025**

1. Pragati Pratik Bendre @  
Pragati Mahesh Chavan  
Age: 27 years,  
Occupation: Homemaker

2. Prajakta Mahesh Chavan  
Age: 25 years,  
Occupation: Service

3. Mahesh Baburao Chavan  
Age: 53 years,  
Occupation: Service

All R/at: Iwale Galli, Maliwada,  
Ahilyanagar, 414001  
(At present Yerwada Central Jail)

... Applicants.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra  
(Through Shirur Police Station)

... Respondent

----

Mr Vaibhav V Ugle, i/b. Rajesh Katore, for the applicants.

Mr SV Walve, APP, for the respondent/ State.

----

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

**Date: 7 November 2025.**

**P.C.:**

By this application, the applicants seek bail in connection

with CR No.575 of 2025, registered at Shirur Police Station, Pune, for offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 119(1), 352, 351(2), 351(3), 189(2), 191(2), 190, and 119(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. According to the First Information Report (FIR), the complainant (mother-in-law of applicant No.1) alleges that there had been recurring domestic disputes between applicant No.1, her son, Pratik, and the complainant over trivial household matters. On 6 August 2025, at about 1:00 a.m., the complainant was awakened by loud arguments outside her house. Upon coming out, she saw applicant No.1, accompanied by applicant No.3 (her father), accused No.3 (her mother), applicant No.2 (her sister), and accused No.5 (her cousin), hurling abuses at and threatening her son Pratik, accusing him of harassing applicant No.1. When the complainant intervened and asked for clarification regarding the situation, applicant No.2 allegedly slapped the complainant on both cheeks, causing her to fall. Upon standing up, applicant No.3 purportedly kicked her in the chest, again causing her to fall to the ground. It is further alleged that applicant No.2 twisted the complainant's left arm, and applicant No.1 forcibly removed a gold necklace weighing approximately 16 grams from the complainant's neck. Following this, all the accused persons

allegedly abused and threatened both the complainant and her son before fleeing the scene.

3. Mr Vaibhav Ugle, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant, asserting the applicants' innocence, submits that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the crime. It is submitted that applicant No.1 is married to the son of the complainant, and the accusations against the applicants stem from a series of reported ill-treatment and threats to the life of applicant No.1, at the hands of the complainant and her family members. In response to these threats, the applicants visited the matrimonial home of applicant No.1. The learned Counsel further contends that in order to preempt any charges of cruelty or harassment, the complainant has fabricated and lodged the present crime based on false and concocted allegations. Even if the prosecution's case were to be accepted at face value, it is submitted that only Section 115(2) of the BNS would be applicable.

4. The learned Counsel further submits that the alleged incident took place on 6 August 2025, and despite the completion of the investigation, the charge sheet has not yet been filed. It is further asserted that, with the investigation now concluded and the co-accused having been granted bail, the

continued detention of the applicants would not serve any purpose. Furthermore, the applicants have established roots within society and pose no flight risk. The applicants are fully prepared to comply with any conditions that this Court may deem appropriate to impose.

5. Mr SV Walve, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/ State, opposes the applicants' request for bail. He submits that the applicants are named in the FIR and a specific role has been ascribed to each of them in the commission of the alleged offence. The learned APP, while acknowledging that the investigation has concluded and a charge sheet will be filed shortly, expresses apprehensions about potential evidence tampering and witness influence if the applicants are released on bail.

6. This Court has given anxious consideration to the rival contentions canvassed across the Bar. It appears that the genesis of the offence stems from a matrimonial dispute. The allegations against the applicants pertain to an alleged incident that occurred on 6 August 2025, where the complainant was allegedly slapped and verbally abused. Notably, no weapon has been used by any of the accused. The allegations in the FIR are contrary to the medical papers. The injury certificate shows

that the injury was caused by a blunt object; however, there is no such allegation of using any weapon in the alleged incident. The attraction of the offence under Section 119(2) BNS appears to be debatable. Furthermore, the learned APP acknowledges that the investigation has concluded, and the charge sheet will be filed shortly. Moreover, the co-accused have already been released on bail. Considering the totality of the circumstances, including the nature of the dispute, the conclusion of the investigation, the contradiction within the prosecution's case, the principle of parity, and the continued detention of the applicants, this Court is of the view that the applicants are entitled to the relief of bail. Hence, the following order:

### **ORDER**

- (i) The applicants shall be released on bail in CR No.575 of 2025, registered at Shirur Police Station, Pune, upon execution of 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.

7. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

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