IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

946 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1863 OF 2026
WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 3861 OF 2026
IN BA/1863/2026

...

RAVINDRA RAGHUNATH CHAVAN AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
...

Advocate for the Applicant : Mr. Jadhav Satej S
APP for Respondent/State : Mr. D.J. Patil
Advocate for Applicant in Cri.Appl.3861/2026 : Mr. Shekade Shashikant E.

...

CORAM : HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.
DATE : 01.10.2026

PER COURT :

. Heard learned Advocate for the Applicants, learned APP for the State and also learned Advocate for informant.

2. The present application seeks regular bail in connection with the Crime No.492 of 2026 dated 15.08.2026 registered with Georai Police Station, District Beed for offences punishable under Sections 108, 3(5), 351(2),352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The applicants were arrested in connection with the aforesaid crime on 15.08.2026 and since then they are in custody. The prosecution story in brief originates from the report came to be lodged by the wife of the deceased, who was employed as a lineman with the MSEDCL department. On 14.08.2026, the deceased left the house on his motorcycle at about 7:00 am. He did not answer the telephone call made by the informant

in afternoon. In the evening, the informant learnt that his motorcycle has been standing near Madhav ginning at Jategaon road since morning. Subsequently, the deceased was found hanging on a neem tree behind the ginning premises. According to the informant, the police came to the spot, took the dead body of the deceased on the ground and while examining his clothes, they recovered a handwritten note from his pocket. The notes described in the FIR was also shown to the informant wherein it is attributed that the decision to commit suicide was due to certain persons. While stating so, the present applicants are named in the said suicide note.

3. The FIR further refers to the long standing dispute concerning approximately two gunthas land situated behind the informant's house. According to the informant, the deceased had purchased the land from the father of applicant No.1 about 20 years earlier, but there was no registered document executed between the parties. The differences arose between the family of the present applicants and the deceased when the construction of the kitchen was undertaken in March 2026. The informant alleges that about a month before the incident, the accused dismantled the iron angles erected on the disputed land and took quarrel. From the said quarrel, it is alleged that accused allegedly struck the deceased on his chest with a brick resulting in his hospitalization.

4. The informant further alleges that after the deceased returned home, the accused, including the present applicants once again abused him and demanded that he should vacate the landed property or pay a sum of Rs.2.00 lakhs. They allegedly threatened to implicate the

deceased in a false criminal case and calls him to use his employment. The first information report does thereafter records that a meeting was held before the village Sarpanch and that the dispute was resolved amicably between the parties by making a payment of Rs.2.00 lakhs. However, it also records the subsequent incident which took place on 12.08.2026, after the dispute was resolved amicably. It is alleged by the informant that the deceased had informed her that on the said date applicant No.2-Raju Rathod alongwith Balu Jadhav and one Vijay Rathod allegedly abused the deceased at a weekly market and threatened to cause him his employment. The informant states that the deceased committed suicide due to continuous mental and physical harassment caused to the deceased. She alleges that the deceased committed suicide on account of harassment caused at the hands of the present applicants and other accused persons.

5. Learned Advocate appearing for the applicants argues that there was a long standing dispute over ownership and possession of the land. He further submits that the informant himself instigated that the dispute between the parties be settled by making payment of Rs.2.00 lakhs. According to the learned Advocate the allegations concerning instigation or intentionally aiding the deceased in committing suicide is not disclosed in the entire FIR. He further argues that applicant No.1 is not named as a participant in the incident dated 12.08.2026. As regards the said incident, learned Advocate for the applicants points out that the informant's statement is based upon the information that was provided to her by the deceased. The said information cannot be said to be a direct evidence, but will fall in the category of a hearsay

evidence which ultimately will have to be proved and tested before the trial Court. He further argues that the applicants have been in custody since 15.08.2026, and the investigation is substantially over and therefore, further detention on the basis of the same is unnecessary.

6. At the outset, when this Court showed disinclination to allow the application of applicant No.2/Raju Rathod, the learned Advocate, on instructions, seeks simpliciter withdrawal of the application to the extent of applicant No. 2, with liberty to file a fresh application, after the charge-sheet is filed.

7. The learned APP vehemently opposes grant of bail even to the applicant No.1/Ravindra Raghunath Chavan. He submits that the allegations against the present applicant is specific that he was present at the incident that has been narrated by the informant in the first information report. He is one of the persons named as responsible for driving the deceased for commissioning of the suicide. He submits that the investigation is still in progress. The other co-accused persons have approached the Sessions Court by way of Anticipatory Bail Application and their investigation is also pending. He thus, submits that taking into consideration the seriousness and gravity of the offence, the application of applicant No.1 should also be rejected.

8. The allegations requiring consideration at this stage include the earlier threats concerning the deceased and naming the deceased in a false criminal case. The other aspects that requires consideration is naming of the applicants in the alleged suicide note. The incident which has been narrated of 12.08.2026, had occurred two days prior to

the death of the deceased also requires the due consideration. These circumstances however, have to be examined separately in relation to the role attributed to the present applicant.

9. In so far as the applicant No.1 is concerned, the distinction in the allegations is clearly visible from the material placed on record. There cannot be a dispute that the name of the present applicant is not mentioned in the alleged note and also in the allegations levelled by the informant in the first information report pertaining to the threats given to the deceased. The important aspect to note is that in the immediate incident prior to the commissioning of the suicide dated 12.08.2026, the name of present applicant No.1/Ravindra Chavhan is not mentioned. The earlier dispute though disregarded but the first information report itself records an intervening settlement between the parties in front of the *Sarpanch* of the village for an amount of Rs.2.00 lakhs. On the material placed before this Court, no subsequent specific act by the present applicant No.1 has been identified between the period of settlement and the incident dated 12.08.2026.

10. It is a settled principle that the abetment requires consideration of whether the accused instigated, participated in a conspiracy accompanied by the requisite act or commission or intentionally aided the act in question. At the stage of bail, the Court can consider the conduct attributed to the particular applicant, without undertaking of final assessment of evidence. The alleged suicide note is relevant and cannot be ignored at this stage. Nevertheless, the name of the present applicant No.1 in that note must be considered together with the specific allegation against him, the acknowledged statement and his

absence during the alleged incident dated 12.08.2026, which is immediately preceding the death.

11. The Court does not consider it appropriate at this stage to reject the allegations pertaining to the incident dated 12.08.2026 merely because the informant learnt about the said from the deceased. Its evidentiary value will have to be considered at the appropriate stage. For the present purpose, the significant circumstance is that the incident is attributed to person other than the present applicant No.1. Likewise, the existence of land dispute does not by itself imposes the criminal liability. The question is whether the material presently available justifies the continued detention of applicant No.1 for the alleged offence.

12. Having regard to the nature of the allegations specifically attributable to the present applicant No.1, the intervening settlement recorded in the FIR and the absence of the name of the present applicant No.1 from the incident on 12.08.2026 coupled with the fact that the present applicant has been in custody since 15.08.2026, I am of the opinion that the applicant No.1/Ravindra Raghunath Chavhan deserves to be released on bail. Hence, the following order is passed:

ORDER

(i) The Bail Application is allowed to the extent of Applicant No.1.

(ii) The applicant No.1 shall be released on bail in Crime No.492 of 2026 dated 15.08.2026 registered with Georai Police Station, District Beed for offences punishable under Sections 108, 3(5), 351(2),352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on furnishing a personal bond of

Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with one or two solvent surety in the like amount, subject to the following conditions :

a) The applicant No.1 shall attend the trial Court on every date fixed, unless his attendance is specifically exempted and shall not take any adjournment before the trial Court.

b) The applicant No.1 shall not, directly or indirectly, contact, threaten, induce or influence the informant or any prosecution witness and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence.

c) The applicant No.1 shall furnish his current residential address and mobile number to the Investigating Officer and the trial Court within seven days of release, intimate any change forthwith, and attend the Investigating Officer till the filing of the charge-sheet.

d) The applicant No.1 shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court and, if he possesses passports, shall deposit the same with the trial Court within seven days of their release.

e) The applicant No.1 shall not involve himself in any offence of a similar nature while on bail.

f) Breach of any of the above conditions shall entitle the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail.

g) All observations in this order are prima facie and confined to the decision of this bail application. The trial Court shall decide the case independently on the evidence led before it. The Bail Application is disposed of in the above terms.

h) Pending Application stands disposed of.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.)

V.S.Joshi