



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 597/2025
XYZ, Victim in Crime no.1428/2025 VS THE STATE OF
MAHARASHTRA & ANOTHER

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Mr. Mahesh Rai, Advocate for appellant.
Mr. H.D.Dubey, A.P.P.for Respondent no.1 /State.
Mr. D.R.Bhoyar, Advocate for respondent no.2.

CORAM: Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.

DATED : 30th APRIL, 2026

1. Heard the learned counsel for the respective parties.
2. By the present appeal under Section 14-A (2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, "Act of 1989"), the appellant seeks to quash and set aside the impugned order dated 18.10.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Wardha, in Criminal Bail Application NO.440/2025, thereby respondent no.2-accused released on anticipatory bail in connection with Crime No.1428/2025 registered on 24.9.2025 with Wardha Police Station for offences punishable under Sections 376 (2)(n), 504 of Indian Penal Code and also under Section 64 (1), 64 (2) (m), 69, 88, 89, 351(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) and under Section 3(1)(w)(i), 3(1)(w)(ii), 3(2)(va), 3(2) and 3(v) of the Act of 1989.
3. Having regard to the submissions canvassed by both sides, I have gone through the FIR as well as

impugned order dated 18.10.2025. As per the contents of the FIR, the appellant-Victim and the respondent no.2 were in love affair and under a false promise of marriage, the appellant-victim developed physical relations with respondent no.2. As a result of the relationship, she conceived; however, the respondent no.2-accused provided medicine to her, resulting in termination of the pregnancy. It is further alleged that the respondent no.2 refused to marry her on the ground that she belongs to a Scheduled Caste.

4. On 18.10.2025, the learned Additional Sessions Judge passed the impugned order observing that the investigation is almost complete and that on the date of the incident, the appellant-victim was a major and sufficiently mature to understand the consequences of engaging in physical relations prior to marriage. The Court further held that custodial interrogation of the respondent no.2 is not necessary.

5. In view of the above, I do not find that the appellant/victim has made out any ground to quash and set aside the impugned order dated 18.10.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Wardha, in Criminal Bail Application No.440/2025. Hence, the appeal stands rejected.

(Y.G.KHOBRADE, J.)