



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

929 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 260 OF 2026

SANTOSH BABURAO JADHAV

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

WITH

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 261 OF 2026

UDDHAV ALIAS SANTOSH ANNASHEB MANDAGE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...

Advocates for Applicants : Mr. Amar Kale, Mr. Aman Sayyed,
Mr. Yuvraj S. Choudhari.

APP for Respondent/s-State : Ms. P. V. Diggikar.

...

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.

DATE : 17.04.2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard both sides.
2. The applicants are seeking enlargement on bail in respect of offence bearing Crime No.803 of 2024, registered with Karjat Police Station, District Ahilyanagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 238, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. The step brother of the deceased Ranjit lodged First Information Report on 23.12.2024 that his brother was missing

since 23.11.2024. It is alleged that Ranjit was having affair with daughter of the applicant Santosh which was not liked by applicant and his wife co-accused Rani. Ranjit was being reprimanded by them from time to time. Later on 23.12.2024 Ranjit was found dead due to strangulation. During the course of investigation, the statement of daughter of the applicant was recorded on 24.12.2024. She was married with co-accused Rushikesh. She committed suicide leaving behind a suicide note implicating the applicants, his wife and her husband. The video was secured from her mobile and transcript thereof is placed on record.

4. Applicants are arrested on 24.12.2024. Charge-sheet was filed on 21.02.2025. In this backdrop, learned counsels for the applicants submit that applicants are falsely implicated in the offence. The story narrated by deceased Mayuri in her statement dated 24.12.2024 and suicide note is imaginary and unreliable. The transcript has no probative value. The statements of neighbours Pawan, Gayatri and Vaishali do not support the prosecution theory. My attention is adverted to extract of the charge-sheet of Crime No.11 of 2024 lodged by the applicants against deceased. It is vehemently contended that applicants had no reason to have a grudge against the

deceased and in fact tried to help him and his daughter previously. The enlargement on bail of co-accused Rani is also brought to my notice.

5. Per contra, learned APP would vehemently submit that there was strong motive for applicants and the co-accused to eliminate Ranjit. It is well hatched conspiracy and incriminating material is collected during the course of investigation. The statement of deceased Mayuri recorded on 24.12.2024 is consistent with transcript and the suicide note. The role played by the applicants has been specifically mentioned. The Post Mortem report also supports the prosecution case indicating that death is due to strangulation.

6. First Information Report spells out the motive against the applicants. The statement of deceased Mayuri recorded on 24.12.2024 discloses infidelity of her mother and collusion with applicants for extracting money. Interestingly, the statement reveals that applicants and his wife permitted deceased Ranjit and the daughter to reside along with them for 15 days. Not only that applicant Santosh is stated to have helped the couple in moving out on or about 14.01.2024 to avoid rage of Rani. The probative value of the statement can be gone into during the course of trial. I am of the considered

view that the statement cannot be said to be *per se* inculpatory. The complex relationship is set out in it.

7. I have gone through First Information Report bearing No.11 of 2024 lodged by the applicant Santosh when his deceased daughter was kidnapped. In investigation of the offence, applicant appears to have gone back foot and stated to have no complaint against deceased Ranjit and his daughter. This is detrimental to the prosecution case to the extent of motive is concerned.

8. There is no eye witness to the incident which occurred at about 9.45 p.m. on 22.12.2024 when deceased is alleged to have been assaulted and strangled. The statement of daughter of the applicant, who claims to be the sole eye witness for the incident needs to be tested during the course of trial. I have already observed that there is a room to say that applicants had helped the daughter and the deceased at one point of time. The implication of the applicants and co-accused at the instance of daughter in her statement is *prima facie* suspicious.

9. No criminal antecedents are reported against the applicants. They are behind bars since 24.12.2024. Considering

the incarceration, I find that they have made out a case to grant bail. Therefore, I pass the following order :

ORDER

- (i) Bail Applications are allowed.
- (ii) Applicants **SANTOSH BABURAO JADHAV** and **UDDHAV ALIAS SANTOSH ANNASAHEB MANDAGE** shall be released on bail in Crime No.803 of 2024, registered with Karjat Police Station, District Ahilyanagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 238, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. on furnishing P. R. bond of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousands only) each with one solvent surety of like amount each on the following conditions :
 - (a) The applicants shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence and contact the prosecution witnesses.
 - (b) The applicants shall surrender their Aadhar Cards and PAN Cards to the Investigating Officer.
 - (c) The applicants shall co-operate for expeditious disposal of the trial and attend the dates punctually.

(iii) Bail applications are disposed of accordingly.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

...

vmk/-