

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
APPEAL NO.1022 OF 2025**

Sunil Vasant Jadhav & Anr.Appellants

Vs.

The State Of Maharashtra & Anr.Respondents

Ms. Smita B. Shinde, with Mr. Parswi Deodhar, for the Appellant.

Mr. Nitin B. Patil, APP, for the Respondent-State.

Mr. N. B. Kamble, PSI, Vishrambag Police Station, Sangli.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATED : 10th FEBRUARY 2026

PC.:-

1. The Appellants have filed the present Appeals challenging the order passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sangli, rejecting the Application filed by the Appellants under Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, seeking discharge of the accused/Applicants from the charges leveled against them under Section 295 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3(1)(t) and 3(2) (va) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

2. The crime was registered as C.R. No. 31 of 2023 at Vishrambag Police Station on 26th January 2023.

3. The complainant, who is a social worker and the President of

Satyashodhak Annabhau Sathe Jayanti Utsav Samiti, received a phone call at about 07:14 hours in the morning from one Mukesh Mohite, informing him that someone had thrown silver colour and red oxide on the statue of Satyashodhak Annabhau Sathe. After receiving the said phone call, he went to the spot and found that silver colour and red oxide had been thrown on the statue as well as on the nameplate. He thereafter informed the Municipal Corporation and the Police Administration and lodged a report against unknown persons. Subsequently, from the CCTV footage, the act of the present two Applicants, who are husband and wife, was noticed.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the Appellants submitted that the complainant has no *locus standi*, as he is not an aggrieved person and, therefore, was not competent to lodge the complaint. It was further submitted that there was no intention on the part of the Appellants to commit any offence, and that the only material against them is the CCTV footage showing the act of throwing silver color, which could be removed immediately. Hence, no offense is made out. On these grounds, it was prayed that the Appellants be discharged from the said crime.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for both the parties.
6. As per the statement made by the accused, though the statement is in the nature of a confessional statement, it indicates that there was a motive on his part to commit the said act.
7. Considering the act of the Appellants, which has been captured in the CCTV footage, no case is made out for discharging the Appellants at this stage. Hence, there is no reason to interfere with the order passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sangli. Accordingly, the Appeal stands **rejected**.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)