

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
BAIL APPLICATION NO.3704 OF 2025**

Rakesh Krushna SonkambleApplicant
Vs.
The State Of Maharashtra & Anr.Respondents

Mr. Shrikant H. Panhale, for the Applicant.
Ms. Asmita Killedar, appointed through legal aid.
Mr. Pankaj P. Deokar, APP, for the Respondent-State.
Mr. Dhiraj P. Parade, Police Constable, 1893, Satara Taluka Police Station.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATED : 5th FEBRUARY 2026

PC.:-

1. The Applicant is arrested in C. R. No.409 of 2024 registered with Satara Taluka Police Station for the offenses punishable under Sections 376, 376(2)(n), 312, 313, read with section 34 of IPC and Sections 4, 6, 8, 12, 17 and 19 of POCSO Act.
2. It is the case of prosecution that the Applicant committed repeated rape upon the victim, who is his cousin. The Applicant and the victim are related and were known to each other. The First Information Report has been lodged by the mother of the victim.

3. It is alleged that the victim informed her mother that she was in love with the Applicant and that, out of such relationship, they used to communicate with each other. The prosecution alleges that the Applicant established physical relations with the victim on the assurance of marriage and had repeated sexual intercourse with her during the period from February 2024 to May 2024. It is further alleged that the victim became pregnant, that the pregnancy was subsequently terminated, and that the parents of the Applicant had also given an assurance of marriage. However, after termination of the pregnancy, the Applicant and his family allegedly refused to solemnize the marriage, and thereafter the complaint came to be lodged, pursuant to which the crime was registered against the Applicant.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the Applicant submits that the Applicant and the victim were in a consensual love relationship and that the Applicant has never denied marriage and is currently ready and willing to marry the victim. It is further submitted that there is no material on record to substantiate the allegation

regarding termination of pregnancy. On the premise that the relationship was consensual and arose out of a love affair, the learned counsel prays for release of the Applicant on bail.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the Applicant and the learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 2.

6. The learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 2 has opposed the release of the Applicant on bail, contending that the offence alleged is of a serious nature. It is submitted that the Applicant is a relative of the victim and there exists a likelihood of the Applicant pressurizing or influencing the witnesses. On these grounds, the learned counsel prays for rejection of the Application.

7. As the victim was 17 years and 8 months of age, she was on the verge of attaining majority and was aware of the consequences of maintaining a relationship with the Applicant. It is alleged that she became pregnant and had given her consent for termination of the pregnancy, at that time she herself disclosed her age as 19 years. Considering that the relationship was admittedly arising out of a love affair and that the Applicant is still ready and willing to marry the

victim, a case is made out for grant of bail to the Applicant. Hence, the following orders:

ORDER

- i) Applicant is **allowed**.
- ii) The applicant, namely, **Rakesh Krushna Sonkamble** shall furnish personal bond of **Rs.25,000/-** with his recent self-attested photograph and surety of the like amount on the following conditions at the satisfaction of the investigating officer;
- iii) The applicant shall remain present before the concerned Police Station on every Thursday between 11.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m;
- iv) The applicant shall cooperate with the investigation and make himself available for interrogation whenever required;
- v) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any witness acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer;
- vi) The applicant shall not obstruct or hamper the police investigation and not to play mischief with the evidence collected or yet to be collected by the Police;

- vii) The applicant shall not leave the territory of Satara, without prior permission of the Court, till trial is over;
- viii) The applicant shall maintain law and order;
- ix) The applicant shall, at the time of execution of the bond, furnish his residential address and contact number to the Investigating Officer, and the court concerned, and shall not change the residence till the final disposal of the case;
- x) The applicant shall surrender his passport, if any, before the Investigating Officer within a week and, if he does not possess any passport, he shall file an affidavit to that effect before the Investigating Officer;
- xi) The applicant shall regularly remain present during the trial, and cooperate with the Hon'ble Court to complete the trial for the above offenses.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)