



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1526 OF 2026

1. Chotu @Chotulal Tamadu Shirsath,
Age: 52 years, Occ. Service (Head Constable)
R/o. Dondaicha Road, Behind Hero Honda
Show Room, Plot no. 10, Sadashiv Nagar,
Shahada, Tq. Shahada, Dist. Nandurbar.

Applicant
(Ori. Accused no.2)

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
2. Bharat Ukha Patil,
Age: 46 years, Occ. Service,
R/o. Shrikrushna Colony,
Mhasawad, Tq. Shahada,
Dist. Nandurbar.

...RESPONDENTS
(Resp. no. 2 ori. informant)

Advocate for Applicant: Mr. A.J. Nagode
APP for Respondent State: Mrs. R.R. Tandale

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.
Dated : April 24, 2026

FINAL ORDER :-

1. Present application is filed with following prayer :-

B) The Criminal proceeding in SCC No. 49 of 2022 pending before Additional Sessions Judge, Shahada, Tq. Shahada, Dist. Nandurbar which is arising out of FIR No. 378 of 2022 dt. 31.5.2022 registered at Shahada Police Station, Tq. Shahada, Dist. Nandurbar for the offence punishable U/sec. 364-A, 120-B, 323, 363, 384, 385,

389, 504, 506 r/w 34 of IPC and Sec. 66-C and 66-D of Information Technology Act may kindly be quashed and set aside to the extent of the applicant.”

2. Investigation was set in motion on the basis of information given by respondent no.2-Bharat Ukha Patil. In nutshell, it is alleged that on 9.4.2022 he received a mobile call from unknown lady. She started conversation with him without giving her introduction. Thereafter, she frequently called him and expressed her desire to meet him.

3. On 3.5.2022 she made video call and exposed private part to him. On 4.5.2022 applicant/accused, who is a police officer called him and asked if he received a video call from a lady and told that information regarding applicant's conversation with lady is given to him by one Bhausahab. Applicant advised that he must settle the matter with lady. On 5.5.2022 again applicant called informant. He took said Bhausahab on conference, who demanded Rs.15 Lakhs to settle matter. On refusal of informant, Bhausahab gave threat to viral video calls and send lady to his home. Finally, informant agreed to pay Rs.9.00 Lakhs towards full and final settlement. On 6.5.2022 on say of applicant, informant went at a place near Patel Residency to deliver cash amount, where he noticed

applicant and that lady sitting in a car. The informant paid Rs. 9.00 Lakhs and requested them to delete video conversation, however, applicant was further blackmailed for same reason.

4. The contents of FIR and statements of witnesses recorded during the course of investigation, clearly depicts involvement of applicant in commission of the offence.

5. Although, learned advocate appearing for applicant persuaded this Court to quash the FIR against applicant claiming that applicant has been falsely implicated due to rivalry with Investigating Officer, this Court has no reason to enter into the defence of falsity raised by the applicant at this stage, particularly, when contents of the FIR and charge-sheet are pinpointing involvement of the applicant in commission of the offence. Investigation papers shows that applicant was one of the shareholder in money extracted from informant.

6. As such, no case is made out to invoke inherent powers under section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code for grant of relief, as claimed. Hence, the application stands **rejected**.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

...

aaa/-f