

Smt. Satinder Kaur Sahni ...Applicant
vs.
State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. L.M. Grower i/b. G.M. Savagave, Advocate
for the Applicant.
Mrs. Rajesh More, APP for the State.

DATE : JANUARY 23, 2015

. The reply filed by the learned APP taken
on record.

2. For the detailed reasons recorded in the order dated 09-01-2015 an ad-interim direction in terms of Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure has been passed in favour of the applicant, amongst other reasons on the count of though the applicant is holding joint account with her husband and the

cheque was given by her husband and nor she has signed the same. The perusal of the reply does not reveal any cogent reason repelling the reasons for which an ad-interim direction was passed.

3. The learned APP tried to urge that since the applicant was having a joint account with her husband, as such she is also beneficiary in receiving the amounts and hence involved in crime. It is urged hence prayer for pre arrest bail deserves to be negatived.

4. It is difficult to accept the submission because merely applicant is having a joint account with her husband would lead to a conclusion that she was beneficiary without there being any further material to denote that she has received the amounts for which the victim was doped. It appears accordingly as even the cheques bounce were not signed by her.

5. In the said premises, for the same reasons for which an ad-interim direction was passed, the same is hereby confirmed.

Application stands disposed of.

(P.D. KODE, J.)