

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY  
APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2254 OF 2015

Ranjana w/o. Abasaheb Ghayal      ....**Applicant**

**Versus**

The State of Maharashtra      ....**Respondent.**

Mr. V.S. Badakh, Advocate for applicant.

Mr. K.M. Suryawanshi, APP for State.

**CORAM : T.V. NALAWADE, J.**

**DATED : 5th May, 2015.**

**ORDER :**

1.            The application is filed for relief of anticipatory bail. This Court had already refused anticipatory bail to the present applicant by passing order on merits on 21.12.2013 in Criminal Application No. 6360/2013.

2.            The learned counsel for applicant submitted that chargesheet is now filed. In that case, the applicant must have been shown as absconding accused and the chargesheet must have been filed under section 299 of Cr.P.C. The learned counsel for applicant submitted that to one accused viz. Ashok Jadhav this Court granted bail. Copy of the order made in Criminal Application No. 6385/2014 is produced and it shows that by

order dated 12.1.2015, this Court granted regular bail to Ashok Jadhav, subject to condition that he deposits the amount of Rs. 6.9 lakh in the crime. Thus, no anticipatory bail was granted by this Court to any of the accused. Crime is registered for the offences punishable under sections 409, 420 r/w. 34 of Indian Penal Code and now chargesheet is filed. In such a case, it can not be said that investigation is completed only because chargesheet is filed. Custodial interrogation is must as there is possibility of revealing more material against accused and recovery of stolen property, if there is custodial interrogation. This Court holds that there is no change in circumstance and this is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail. There is no need to issue notice to other side in view of these circumstances.

3. In the result, the application is rejected.

**[ T.V. NALAWADE, J. ]**

ssc/