



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

34 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 361 OF 2026

RAJAN YADAV LOT

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Applicant : Ms. Kulkarni Rashmi S.

APP for Respondent/s-State : Mr. C. V. Bhadane.

...

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.

DATE : 09.04.2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard this matter for some time.
2. Applicant is seeking bail in very serious offence in which five minor girls of a tender age are the victims. The allegations are about sexual exploitation. I have gone through the papers of the investigation. Medico Legal Examination Report of the victims in case of ABC and DEF are disturbing. I have reservations for the manner in which the investigation is conducted in such highly sensitive matter. Certain aspects of the investigation have not been clarified by learned APP.
3. Normally, conducting of the investigation is prerogative of concerned Officer. This is an exceptional case when this Court feels that the Investigating Officer should have been

more alert. I find lapses on part of Medical Officer also who conducted examination of the victims. I expect Investigating Officer shall remain present before this Court on the next date.

4. The disturbing factors which surfaced from the police papers and for which explanation is required from the Investigating Officer are as follows :

(i) Whether CCTV footage of the spot in question for 17.08.2025 as well as 31.08.2025 was available ?

(ii) Whether the CCTV footage recovered is the only available material ?

(iii) Whether another access to the terrace was available which is shown in the transcript panchnama?

(iv) Whether any attempt is made to point out the medical officer the discrepancies in the column No.22, 23 and 33 of report of ABC.

(v) The discrepancy in column No.23 and letter dated 17.09.2025 in case of ABC.

(vi) The discrepancy of column No.7 regarding date in case of DEF.

5. List this matter on 20.04.2025. High on board.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

...

vmk/-