



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

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 138 OF 2026

SACHIN SURESH MAIDAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Narayan B. Narwade
APP for Respondent : Ms. R. R. Tandale
...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 13-02-2026

PER COURT:-

1. The applicant seeks bail in connection with Crime No.0514 of 2025 dated 08.05.2025 registered with Pathardi Police Station, District Ahmednagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1) and 238 of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023*. In the said crime, the applicant was arrested on 08.10.2025. After completion of the investigation, the chargesheet has been filed.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the deceased, Kisanabai Chagan Maidad, mother of the informant, Chhaya, resided alone in Miri village, Pathardi taluka. The applicant, Suresh (identified as the brother of Sachin and Chaitanya and nephew of the informant), resided in Ahilyanagar. Following the sale of land registered in her name, the deceased reportedly distributed Rs.5 Lakh each to the applicant and his brother. However, she maintained a deposit of

Rs.1,80,000 in the Indian Overseas Bank, Miri branch, naming Chaitanya as the sole nominee. This nomination led to a dispute during Makar Sankranti 2024, during which the applicant allegedly quarreled with and assaulted the deceased. It is further alleged that between 06.05.2025 at approximately 02:30 p.m. and 08.05.2025 at 10:45 a.m., the applicant traveled to the deceased's residence in his tempo, where he struck her with stones on the ota (veranda) of her house and subsequently poured kerosene on her and set her ablaze to destroy the evidence. Hence, the report.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated based on mere suspicion and that the chargesheet lacks incriminating evidence. It is contended that as the deceased's grandson, the applicant had no motive for murder, and the alleged dispute over a Rs.2 lakh investment does not establish such a grave crime. The informant initially failed to name the applicant due to alleged fear, only later raising suspicions without factual basis.

4. Furthermore, the applicant pleads an alibi, asserting he was in Pune delivering goods during the incident; this is reportedly supported by Call Detail Records (CDR) and CCTV footage indicating his presence in Ahilyanagar and Pune between 06.05.2025 and 08.05.2025. Furthermore, it is submitted that the postmortem was irregularly conducted on-site and the prosecution

relies on inadmissible evidence. Given the applicant's clear criminal antecedents and his willingness to abide by any court imposed conditions, counsel prays for the application to be allowed.

5. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application, contending that the applicant, being a close relative of the informant and witnesses, is likely to tamper with prosecution evidence if released. It is submitted that the applicant committed the gruesome murder of his 75-year-old grandmother over a financial grudge regarding the nomination of his brother for her bank funds and further expressed the apprehension that applicant if released on bail may influence the witnesses.

6. Having heard the respective counsel from both the sides and upon perusal of the material on record, including the charge sheet indicates the allegations rests on a property dispute and a disagreement over bank nominations, alleging that the applicant murdered his 75-year-old grandmother and attempted to destroy evidence. The applicant has no criminal antecedents.

7. Considering that the applicant has deep roots in society and poses no risk of fleeing, ensuring availability for the purpose of trial, and also the investigation is complete with the chargesheet already filed, further detention as an under-trial prisoner appears neither warranted nor justifiable; furthermore, in light of the

significant number of accused and witnesses to be examined, it is highly unlikely that the trial will commence and conclude within a reasonable period, thereby I am inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the applicant.

8. Hence, the following order:-

ORDER

- (i) The bail application is allowed.
- (ii) Applicant, Sachin Suresh Maidad, be released on bail, upon furnishing P.R. bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rs.Fifty Thousand) with one or two local solvent sureties, in the like amount, in connection with Crime No.0514 of 2025 dated 08.05.2025 registered with Pathardi Police Station, District Ahmednagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1) and 238 of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023*, on the following conditions :-
 - (a) The applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the prosecution evidence, in any manner.
 - (b) The applicant shall attend the trial on each and every date unless exempted by the trial Court and shall not leave the area of jurisdiction of the concerned Police Station till conclusion of the trial.

- (c) The applicant shall submit Aadhar and Pan Cards to the Investigating Officer and detailed address and phone numbers and two of the near relatives.
- (d) In case of breach of any of the conditions by the applicant, it is open for the Prosecution to move this Court seeking cancellation of bail.
- (iii) Needless to state 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]
JUDGE

rrd