



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2462 OF 2025

RANI SAMBHAJI DENGLE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Shah Shahrukh Ahemad A.
APP for Respondents-State : Mr. G. O. Wattamwar

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.
Date : 29th January, 2026

ORDER :-

1. The applicant has approached this Court seeking regular bail in connection with FIR dated 05.11.2025 bearing Crime No. 1132 of 2025 registered with MIDC Waluj Police Station, Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 117(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. According to the prosecution, the deceased, Nandu, was the brother of the informant Yogesh Vispute. On 18.10.2025, the informant visited home with his mother and sister. Approximately at 02:00 a.m., his sister Manisha, informed him via telephone that Nandu had been involved in an altercation with a woman residing in his neighborhood. During this incident, the

woman allegedly assaulted Nandu by striking him on the head and neck with a stone. Subsequently, on 19.10.2025 at about 12:00 p.m., the informant visited the locality to inquire about the dispute. Nandu disclosed that the accused Rani, suspected him of insulting her in public. Consequently, allegedly abused Nandu, assaulted with fists and feet and struck with a stone, resulting in a head injury.

3. It is further alleged that following the disclosure, the informant urged Nandu to lodge a police complaint against Rani. However, Nandu declined to do it, opting instead to seek medical treatment and remain at home. On 23.10.2025 at approximately 09:45 p.m., Nandu collapsed while working at a construction site. Co-workers transported him to Ghati Hospital, Aurangabad, for emergency care. The informant then proceeded to the MIDC Waluj Police Station to file a FIR against the accused, leading to the registration of C.R. No. 1132/2025. On 05.11.2025, at about 09:45 p.m., Nandu succumbed to injuries. The accused Rani was subsequently arrested on 06.11.2025.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the offence. The alleged incident on 19.10.2025 was a sudden quarrel, lacking any

premeditation or motive to cause death. It is further submitted that the deceased sustained the alleged injury on 19.10.2025 but only collapsed on 23.10.2025 while performing heavy manual labour. This is case of false implication. Hence, it is prayed that the application be allowed.

5. The learned APP opposed the application, submitting that the offence is serious in nature and that there is sufficient material on record to establish the applicant's complicity. Furthermore, the APP argued that if the applicant is released on bail, there is every possibility of the prosecution evidence being tampered with or the offence being repeated. Accordingly, it was prayed that the application be rejected.

6. Upon considering the submissions of both sides and perusing the material on record, including the charge-sheet, it is prima facie evident that the alleged assault occurred on 18.10.2025, but the deceased collapsed much later on 23.10.2025. The deceased reportedly refused medical treatment and a police complaint immediately following the incident. This refusal to seek professional care could be viewed as a break in the chain of causation, shifting the focus from the assault to the lack of timely medical intervention. Although the informant and witnesses were

aware of the alleged assault on 18.10.2025, the FIR was registered after the deceased collapsed on 23.10.2025. Such an unexplained delay prima facie indicates the possibility of false implication.

7. Pertinently, the alleged weapon and other articles connected with the crime have already been recovered by the Investigating agency. The investigation of the case is almost complete . As such, nothing further remains to be recovered from the instance of the present applicant. Moreover, the applicant is a woman and, as such, falls under the protective umbrella of the first proviso to Section 480(1) of the BNSS.

8. In view of the above, further detention of the applicant as an under trial prisoner, in the circumstances of the case, does not seem to be either warranted or justifiable. I am, therefore, persuaded to exercise the discretion in favour of the applicant.

9. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

- (I) Application is **allowed**.
- (II) Applicant – Rani Sambhaji Dengle be released on regular bail on furnishing P.R. bond of Rs. 50,000/- (Fifty Thousand Only) with one or two local solvent

sureties in the like amount, in Crime No. 1132 of 2025 registered with MIDC Waluj Police Station, Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 117(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on the following conditions :-

- (a) The applicant shall attend each and every date of the Trial Court unless exempted by the Trial Court.
 - (b) The applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence, in any manner.
 - (c) The applicant shall submit his Aadhar and Pan Card to the Investigation Officer and detailed addresses and phone numbers of applicant and two of the near relatives.
 - (d) Breach of any of the conditions by the applicants would entail the cancellation of the bail.
- (III) Needless to states that the observations rendered herein are to the extent of this application and the trial court shall not be influenced by the same.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)