



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 982 OF 2026

UMESH DEVIDAS CHAVAN

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Avinash N. Barhate Patil

APP for Respondents-State : Mr. D. J. Patil

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

Date : 9th June, 2026

ORDER :-

1. The applicant has approached this Court seeking regular bail in connection with FIR dated 18.04.2026 bearing Crime No. 234 of 2026 registered with Satara Police Station, Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar for the offences punishable under Sections 69, 118(1), 351(2), 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The informant is a married woman who has been living separately from her husband since 2017 due to domestic disputes. In October 2017, she met the accused at a Dandiya event and their acquaintance soon developed into a romantic relationship. Despite being informed about her marriage and children, the accused expressed no objections. On 19.10.2017, during the Diwali festival,

the accused visited her residence and engaged in sexual intercourse with her under a promise of marriage. When questioned about the solemnization of marriage, he assured victim that they would cohabit as husband and wife and formalize marriage later. Based on this continuous pretext, the accused maintained physical relations with her over the years, while also bearing her household expenses and the educational costs of her children.

3. The deception came to light in the year 2025 when the accused travelled to his native village and married another woman. Upon being confronted by the informant, the accused threatened her, disclosing that he had secretly recorded videos of their physical intimacy. He blackmailed her by stating that he would expose these videos to her children if she revealed their relationship to anyone. Subsequently, on 17.04.2026, the informant visited the accused at his SRPF Camp to question him regarding the marriage. On this occasion as well, the accused engaged in sexual intercourse under the same promise of marriage. However, when she insisted that he accompany her home, the accused refused, assaulted her with a vegetable cutter and inflicted injuries that led to her hospitalization. Following this

incident, the informant lodged a FIR.

4. The learned counsel for applicants submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the case. The case of the prosecution itself indicates that the applicant and the informant were in a voluntary relationship that spanned nearly nine years, from October 2017 until 2026. The arrest of the applicant has been effected on 04.05.2026 and since then, is in jail. The investigation is on the verge of completion. Hence, prayed to allow the application on the ground of parity.

4. Per contra, the learned APP vehemently opposed the application submitting that the Applicant induced the informant into a sexual relationship through a deliberate, false promise of marriage made right from the inception on 19.10.2017. He consistently maintained this false pretext over eight years to exploit the informant under the guise of cohabiting as husband and wife. Further submits that the crime is serious in nature and there is sufficient material indicating the complicity of the applicants. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

5. Upon considering the submission of both the sides and perusing the material on record, prima facie, it appears that the

relationship between the Applicant and the informant spanned a prolonged period of nearly nine years, from October 2017 until April 2026. The informant is a mature, adult woman living separately from her spouse. The prosecution's case confirms that during this period, the parties cohabited closely and the applicant actively contributed to the informant's household and her children's educational expenses.

7. The investigation of the case is almost completed. As such, nothing remains to be recovered or discovered at the instance of the Applicant. The arrest of the applicant has been effected on 04.05.2026 and since then, is in jail. Thus, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant behind the bar and can be enlarged on bail by imposing stringent conditions.

8. Keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the applicant entitled for bail. The learned APP's apprehension about tampering with the prosecution evidence can be adequately taken care of by imposing stringent conditions.

9. Hence, the following order :-

ORDER

(I) Application is **allowed**.

- (II) Applicant – Umesh Devidas Chavan 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 connection with Crime No. 234 of 2026 registered with Satara Police Station, Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar for the offences punishable under Sections 69, 118(1), 351(2), 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on the following conditions :-
- (a) The applicants shall attend each and every date of the Trial Court unless exempted by the Trial Court.
 - (b) The Applicants shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence, in any manner.
 - (c) The applicants shall submit their Aadhar and Pan Cards to the Investigation Officer and detailed addresses and phone numbers of applicants and two of the near relatives.
- (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.)