



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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 590 OF 2026

1. SACHIN ABASAHEB MASKE
2. SUMIT DINKAR SHINDE
3. DINKAR SHRIRANG SHINDE
4. TUKARAM SHESHERAO SHINDE
5. SOW. MEERABAI DINKAR SHINDE
6. VISHNU SHESHERAO SHINDE
7. VIKAS DINKAR SHINDE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...

Advocate for Applicants : Mr. Kailas Annarao Kadam

APP for Respondents/State : Mrs. P. J. Bharad

...

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.

DATE : 29th APRIL 2026

PER COURT :

1. Not on board. Mentioned. Taken on board.
2. Heard the learned Counsel for the Applicants and the learned APP for the State.
3. The Applicants have approached this Court, seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Crime No.37/2026 registered with Latur Rural Police Station, District Latur for the offences punishable under Sections 108, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

4. The learned Counsel for the Applicant, Mr. Kadam, submits that the Applicants have been falsely implicated in the present crime for allegedly instigating or abetting the commission of suicide by the deceased, Bhishmcharya Kamble. Even if the allegations in the FIR are taken to be true, no offence of abetment of commission of suicide punishable under Section 108 BNS can be said to be made out against the Applicants. The FIR itself refers to the incident dated 08.03.2026, for which the FIR was registered by the son of the Complainant against the accused persons. By no stretch of imagination can the same, by itself, amount to instigation or abetment of suicide. The FIR further shows that when the wife of the deceased left the house on the date of the incident at 06:00 a.m., the deceased was present in the house. There are no averments of any incident narrated by the deceased or the Complainant's wife about any occurrence on the previous night which could be linked to the death of the deceased. Except for the aforesaid FIR filed by the Complainant against Applicant Nos. 1 and 2, the other Applicants do not have any criminal antecedents. The learned Sessions Court rejected the bail application only on the ground that a suicide note was found in the pocket of the deceased. However, there are no observations as to whether any of the Applicants have been attributed any role in the suicide note. The Applicants are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, the Applicants pray for protection.

5. As against this, the learned APP strongly opposes the

present application on the ground that the Applicants are involved in the serious offence of abetment of commission of suicide, punishable under Section 108 BNS with imprisonment up to ten years. Applicant Nos. 1 and 2 were earlier involved in assaulting the Complainant's son, and an FIR was registered against them on 11.03.2026. All the Applicants have threatened the Complainant with dire consequences for registering the FIR against Applicant Nos. 1 and 2. The Applicants are directly implicated in the FIR, and hence there is ample evidence to bring home their guilt in the said crime. Statements recorded during the course of investigation corroborate the allegations in the FIR. Thus, this is not a fit case to release the Applicants on bail. Considering the earlier FIR registered by the son of the Complainant, there is every likelihood that the Applicants may commit a cognizable offence if released on bail in the same village. The application is therefore liable to be rejected.

6. I have gone through the investigation papers made available by the learned APP. I have also gone through the order passed by the learned Sessions Court. The learned Sessions Court has observed that a suicide note was found in the pocket of the deceased. The investigation papers show the gist of the suicide note, which states that the deceased had written that nobody was responsible for his death and that he himself should be held responsible for committing suicide. The entire suicide note is not available in the investigation papers and is reported to have been sent to the handwriting expert for obtaining his report. The investigation appears to have been

completed without the custodial interrogation of the Applicants. Whether the allegations of threats extended to the deceased, as alleged in the FIR, would amount to instigation or abetment of commission of suicide is a matter to be evaluated by the Trial Court after leading evidence to that effect.

. Be that as it may, taking into consideration the nature of the allegations and the fact that the investigation appears to have been completed, the custodial interrogation of the Applicants may not be necessary. However these are observations prima facie in nature and the same shall not influence the trial Court. The apprehensions of the APP can be taken care of by imposing appropriate conditions. Hence, I am inclined to protect the Applicants, however upon certain conditions. Hence the following order :

ORDER

(i) In the event of arrest of the Applicants - Sachin Abasaheb Maske; Sumit Dinkar Shinde; Dinkar Shrirang Shinde; Tukaram Shesherao Shinde; Sow. Meerabai Dinkar Shinde; Vishnu Shesherao Shinde; Vikas Dinkar Shinde in connection with Crime No.37/2026 registered with Latur Rural Police Station, District Latur for the offences punishable under Sections 108, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, they be released on bail on furnishing PR. bond of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) each with two solvent sureties in the like amount, on the following conditions :

(a) The Applicants shall attend Latur Rural Police Station, District Latur on every Saturday between 11:00 am. to 01:00 pm. and

thereafter as when called by the Investigating Officer, till filing of the charge-sheet.

(b) The Applicants shall not enter the Village Sirsi, District Latur, till framing of the charge.

(c) The Applicants shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence and shall not influence the witnesses.

(d) The Applicants shall submit their Aadhar and PAN Cards to the Investigating Officer and detailed addresses and phone numbers of themselves and two of the near relatives.

(e) A single violation of the conditions would entitle the prosecution to seek cancellation of the bail.

(ii) The application is allowed in the above terms and stands disposed of.

MEHROZ K. PATHAN
JUDGE

NATJEEB..