

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

Criminal Application No.1350 of 2016

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

Versus

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

Shri. S.S. Choudhari, Advocate, holding for Shri. A.A. Shelke, Advocate, for appellant.

Shri. S.D. Kaldate, Additional Public Prosecutor, for the respondent.

CORAM: T.V. NALAWADE, J.

DATE : 11th MARCH 2016

ORDER:

1) The application is filed for relief of anticipatory bail. Crime is registered for offences punishable under sections 409, 420 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code against the present applicant and others. The first application for the relief of anticipatory bail bearing Criminal Application No.6360 of 2013 was rejected by this Court on merits by order dated 21-12-2013. Second application, bearing Criminal Application No.2254 of 2015

came to be rejected on merit on 5-5-2015. It is surprising that police are not taking steps to get this lady in such a serious crime and charge sheet is filed in Court by showing this lady as absconding.

2) Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that as charge sheet is filed it needs to be presumed that investigation is complete. This proposition cannot be accepted. Serious crime is committed. Powers of police to make investigation continue and powers do not come to an end only because charge-sheet is filed. When such serious crime is committed custodial interrogation is always desirable. In view of such necessity this Court has rejected the previous two applications on merits. This Court granted regular bail to one applicant like Ashok but that does not mean that due to this circumstance present applicant needs to be granted relief of anticipatory bail. This Court is again observing that it is not only surprising but also shocking that police are not showing interest to take action against the present applicant. Copy of this order be sent to the Superintendent of Police Beed who is expected to take

appropriate action against the concerned as this Court formed opinion that unnecessary favours are being shown to the present applicant.

3) The application stands rejected.

Sd/-
(T.V. NALAWADE, J.)

rs1