

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

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3432 OF 2025

Vanita Baburao Patil

...Applicant

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

Mr. Satyavrat Joshi a/w Mr. Yash Ganesh Fadtare, Advocate for Applicant.

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

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.

DATE : 27th JANUARY 2026.

P.C.

1. By this application, the applicant seeks bail in Crime No.73 of 2025 registered with Kavathemahankal Police Station, District Sangli for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The prosecution case in short is that the present crime is registered against accused Nos.1 to 3 on the basis of complaint lodged by P.S.I. Shri. Masale. It is alleged in the complaint that, accused No.1 is son, accused No.3/applicant is wife of deceased and accused No.2 is friend of accused No.1. Initially, accidental death of deceased - Baburao Dattatray Patil was reported to Kavathemahankal Police Station. Accordingly, Crime No.11/2025 was registered and investigation under Section 194 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha

Sanhita was carried out. During investigation, the statement of accused Nos.1 and 2 were recorded and the accused No.1 stated therein that on the date of alleged accident of Baburao Dattatraya Patil he went to Karad and in the evening he returned to his house. The accused No.1 also stated the similar fact about accused No.2 and further stated that he was at home on the date of said accident. However, according to the C.D.R. letter received by the complainant shows that accused No.2 was at Shirdhon vicinity which has created suspicion in the statements of the accused Nos.1 and 2. Further, the CCTV footage of Baba Hotel which is near the accident spot of deceased Baburao Dattatraya Patil shows that accused No.1 and accused No.2 had visited the said hotel along-with deceased Baburao Dattatraya Patil at around 21.00 hours on 09.02.2025. The daughter of the deceased stated that applicant/accused No.3 being her mother confessed before her that on 10.02.2025 in the night between 02:00 hours to 03:00 hours accused Nos.1 to 3 in furtherance of their common intention committed murder of Baburao Dattatraya Patil to grab money from insurance company.

3. Heard learned Advocate for the applicant and learned APP for the Respondent-State. Perused the charge-sheet.

4. From the charge-sheet, *prima facie* it appears that the applicant has taken active part in the commission of murder of her

husband/Deceased – Baburao Dattatray Patil. She has made an inquiry with the LIC agent about LIC Policy, which stands in the name of deceased-husband and if the death is caused by accident then how much LIC amount will she get. She requested LIC agent not to disclose the fact that she has made inquiry about the LIC policy. After the death of deceased, the applicant made inquiry with the LIC agent as to when she would get the LIC amount with respect to the policy, standing in the name of the deceased. She has made extra judicial confession to her daughter Akshata Patil that her deceased husband had borrowed loans from people and those people were harassing to return the said loans. The deceased was having LIC Policy of Rs.50,00,000/-. Therefore, she along with co-accused hatched a conspiracy to commit murder of her husband. Accordingly, the deceased was taken by them in car and by hitting his head on the divider on Miraj-Pandharpur road near Landgewadi, committed his murder. Similar extra judicial confession is made by accused No.1/son of the deceased and applicant, before one Sagar Patil. At the time of incident, the applicant along with others was seen standing at the spot of incident along with motor car bearing no. MH-10-DL-9238. Thus, *prima facie* there appears evidence showing active involvement of the applicant in the present crime.

5. Considering the *prima facie* involvement of the applicant in the present crime and gravity of the offence, this is not a fit case to grant discretionary relief of bail to the applicant. The application is therefore rejected.

(NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)