

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

52 CR. APPLICATION NO. 2 OF 2026

Mangal Yashwant Borkar

...Applicant

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Ajit M. Savagave (Through V.C.) a/w Mr. Manthan S. Bhandigare,
Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. S. S. Chaudhari, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.

DATE : 29th JANUARY 2026

P.C.

1. By this application, the applicant/informant seeks cancellation regular bail granted to the second respondent by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jaisingpur by order dated 26.11.2025.

2. The informant lodged FIR against respondent No.2 alleging that the deceased Pratiksha, who was daughter of complainant – Mangal Borkar was residing at the house of complainant's mother at Indira Nagar Housing Society, Jaisingpur. Pratiksha used to come to visit the complainant. On 29.10.2025, at 11:00 a.m. Pratiksha had come to meet complainant. Thereafter, complainant had frequent phone calls with Pratiksha. On 02.11.2025, in the morning at 8:30 a.m. complainant and her younger daughter Tanisha went for their

work at Kurundwad. They returned at Jaisingpur at 12:00 noon. They saw the chappal of Pratiksha outside the house. They went in the house and they saw that Pratiksha had committed suicide by hanging herself. On the bed, there was notebook of Pratiksha and it was written that “I am ending myself because of Shubham Patil 9209273123, 9623058586”. It was further alleged that on the earlier day of the incident, one lady and two men had come to the house of complainant and they inquired about Pratiksha. After funeral, complainant lodged report in the police station.

3. Pursuant to the registration of crime, the second respondent was arrested on 17.11.2025. Thereafter, he preferred criminal bail application for releasing him on bail on 20.11.2025. The informant opposed the bail application. On 26.11.2025, the Sessions Court has allowed the application by observing that the suicide note is seized. Sufficient time was there for the police to investigate the crime. The second respondent is young and antecedents are clear. The Sessions Court, therefore though it a fit case to exercise the discretion by releasing the second respondent on bail.

4. Learned Advocate for the applicant strenuously argued that the allegations against the second respondent are serious and he has tortured and harassed the deceased, which led her to commit suicide. Therefore, this is a clear case of abetment of suicide by the second

respondent. He therefore, submits that the trial Court was not justified in granting bail to the second respondent.

5. Taking into consideration the allegations made against the second respondent and the fact that the investigation by the police is on the verge of completion, the suicide note is already recovered. There is no need of custodial interrogation of the second respondent, which will amount to pre-trial punishment to the second respondent.

6. The trial Court has rightly exercised discretion in favour of the second respondent. No case is made out by the applicant to cancel the bail granted in favour of the second respondent. The application is therefore rejected.

(NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)