IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 579 OF 2026

UDAY SHIVAJI JAGTAP
Digitally signed by UDAY SHIVAJI JAGTAP
Date: 2026.10.27 11:26:31 +0530

Vishal Mahadev Jadhav … Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. … Respondents

.....

Mr. Amit Icham (through VC) for the Applicant
Mr. N.B. Patil, APP for the Respondent – State
Mr. S.S. Bhagat, ASI, Shirval Police Station present

.....

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.

DATED : 22nd OCTOBER, 2026.

P C :

. Heard both sides.

2. The applicant is seeking bail in respect of offence bearing Crime No. 386 of 2025 registered with Shirval Police Station, Satara for the offences punishable under Sections 111(1), 111(2)(b)(3)(4), 119(1), 308(5), 140(3), 118(1), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 314 r/w 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Applicant is arrested on 10.11.2025 and present bail application is preferred after filing of the charge-sheet.

4. The counsel for the applicant submits that he is falsely implicated in the offence. There is no incriminating material against him. The

theory of the prosecution regarding honey trap has no foundation. It is submitted that co-accused Irfan has also been released on bail. There is no extortion or blackmailing at the instance of the applicant. The transcript panchanama and CDR record do not support the prosecution case. The theory that Alto car being Registration No. MH-12.NE-3972 was forcibly taken by the applicant and the co-accused is misconceived. The applicant has disclosed the antecedents but that cannot be a ground to deny the bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned APP tenders on record a photocopy of the order of externment passed on 19.09.2025 against the applicant. He draws my attention to the antecedents against the applicant. It is submitted that the statement of witnesses refers to the role played by the applicant. The involvement of the applicant is very apparent and he is not entitled to bail.

6. The offence was registered stating that the informant was using a dummy user account and he had chat with one lady and he developed friendship with her. He was called at a particular place by the lady who lured him for sexual pleasures. On 20.10.2025 when they decided to meet at Veer Dharan, that time five persons on two motorcycles arrived there and intercepted the informant. He was forcibly abducted in his

own car and taken to unknown place. He was been constantly beaten, abused and threatened. The co-accused Kiran was threatening him as the informant was chatting with his wife. The applicant and the co-accused forcibly retained the Car and demanded ransom.

7. It is necessary to consider first a very relevant plea raised by learned APP. The applicant suffered proceedings of externment under Section 55 of the Maharashtra Police Act. He was externed by order dated 19.09.2025 for two years from entire Satara District. The first information report in the present case was lodged on 10.11.2025 alleging the incident of 19.10.2025 and 20.10.2025 which occurred in the Satara District. The presence of the applicant is evident from the papers of the investigation at the relevant time in Satara District. It is ex facie clear that applicant violated the order of externment and the present offence is committed.

8. The order of externment has not been set aside by any competent forum. It is disclosed that there are five offences pitted against him, which are with Shirval and Khandala Police Stations. Those offences are serious in nature. The externment order shows his active role as a member of a gang. Thus, the offence alleged against the applicant is aggravated form of misconduct. I am of the considered view that no

leniency can be shown to him who is habitual offender.

9. The antecedents against the applicant are of serious offences. He is frequently indulging in criminal activities. His enlargement on the bail is not only threat to the informant and witnesses but the society at large. In such a case he is not entitled to be released on bail.

10. I have considered the statement of Sunil, Shankar and the papers of investigation which would show involvement of the applicant. He is not entitled to parity because the role attributed to accused no.4 - Irfan is different.

11. In that view of the matter, I am not inclined to grant a relief. Bail Application is rejected.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)