

Shubhada S Kadam

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

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3242 OF 2025

Maruti @ Dagdu Punaji Shelkande
Versus
The State of Maharashtra and anr.

Mr. Satyavrat Joshi along with Mr. Samay Pawar i/b. Mr. Priyesh More,
Advocate for Applicant.

Ms. Ranjana D. Humane, APP for Respondent No1-State.

Mr. Chetan G. Gogawale, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.
DATE : 11th FEBRUARY, 2026.

P.C. :

1. By this application, the applicant is seeking regular bail in Crime No. 57 of 2025 registered with Junnar Police Station, District Pune, for the offences punishable under Sections 64, 115(2) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4, 6, 8 and 12 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

2. It is prosecution's case that on 18th February 2025, the applicant took the victim in her house and sexually assaulted her and threatened the victim not to disclose the incident to anyone. When the applicant was escaping from the victim's house, at that time, the younger brother of the victim came and he tried to catch the applicant, but by kicking him, the applicant ran away.

3. It is contention of learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant has been falsely implicated. In this case there was a fight between the applicant, victim and her brother, but the victim was never

Digitally
signed by
SHUBHADA
SHANKAR
KADAM
Date:
2026.02.13
11:06:29
+0530

Shubhada S Kadam

sexually assaulted. The applicant is behind bars around one year, he has no antecedents and requested to allow the application.

4. It is contention of learned APP along with learned counsel for respondent No.2 that at the time of the incident, the victim was 15 years 8 months old. The applicant dragged her in the house and sexually assaulted her. A complaint was immediately lodged. The victim's brother was kicked by the applicant. The medical report supports the prosecution case and requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel, perused charge-sheet, and documents produced on record. The complaint was lodged immediately after the incident. At the time of the incident, the victim was around 15 years old. The medical report produced on record supports the prosecution case. Though it is contention of the applicant that there was fight between them, and he has been falsely implicated in this case, but at this stage, there is no reason to disbelieve the statement of the victim. If the applicant is released on bail, he may threaten the victim and prosecution witnesses as applicant is the resident of the same village in which the victim resides. Considering these facts, I pass following order:

ORDER

(i) The application is rejected.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)