Shubhada S Kadam

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 239 OF 2026

1. Sumit Kumar Niranjan Prasad Roy
2. Arti Sumit Roy
3. Ramesh Kumar Sagar Rai ...Applicant/s

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
2. Vinodkumar Firangi Rautrao ...Respondent/s

Mr. Raviraj Gamare along with Mr. Narendra Soneji, Advocates for Applicants.

Mr. B. B. Kulkarni, APP for Respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Prashant Laxman Rathod, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.
DATE : 5th OCTOBER, 2026.

P.C. :

SHUBHADA SHANKAR KADAM

Digitally signed by SHUBHADA SHANKAR KADAM
Date: 2026.10.06 18:32:17 +0530

1. The challenge in this application is to the impugned order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-4, Kalyan, whereby the discharge application of the applicants was rejected.

2. It is prosecution's case that the daughter of the first informant committed suicide by hanging. It is alleged that the said suicide was committed due to mental and physical harassment caused by the applicants.

3. It is contention of learned counsel for the applicants that the applicants have been falsely implicated in this case. At the time of the

incident, the deceased was not staying with the applicants. The alleged allegations of harassment were prior to two to three years of the incident. However, these facts are not considered by the learned Sessions Judge and has passed the impugned order. No case is made out against the applicants, and requested to allow the application.

4. It is contention of learned APP that there are specific allegations against the applicants that due to the mental and physical harassment caused by them, the deceased committed suicide. Learned Sessions Judge has passed a well-reasoned order and no interference is required in it, and requested to reject the application.

5. It is contention of learned counsel for the first informant that the complaint was filed due to misunderstanding. There was no mental or physical harassment caused by the applicants to the deceased. The first informant has filed an affidavit in reply stating that he has no objection to allowing the application, and requested to pass appropriate orders.

6. I have heard all learned counsel, perused impugned order and documents produced on record. Admittedly, at the time of the incident, the deceased was not staying with the applicants, and the alleged allegations of harassment are prior to two years of the incident. The statement of witness Rohitkumar Vinodkumar Rai, brother of the deceased, shows that he has no complaint regarding the suicidal death of his sister. As the

applicants were not staying with the deceased at the time of the incident, and the alleged allegations against the applicants are prior to two years of the suicide, it cannot be said that the applicants were involved in the abetment or instigation of the suicide. However, these facts are not considered by the learned Sessions Judge. No case is made out against the applicants. Considering these facts, I pass following order:

O R D E R

(1) The impugned order dated 24th April 2026 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-4, Kalyan, below Exhibit-11 in Session Case No.52 of 2022 is quashed and set aside.

(ii) The applicants are discharged in Sessions Case No.52 of 2022

The revision application is allowed in above terms and disposed of.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)