

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.540 OF 2016

Ms.Surekha Rajendra Suryavanshi ... Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

Mr.S.R. Pasbola i/b Rahul Arote for the Applicant
Ms.Rutuja Ambekar, APP, for Respondent – State

CORAM: **MRS.MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.**

DATE: **MARCH 23, 2016**

P.C.:

1. The applicant-accused is prosecuted for the offences punishable under sections 419, 420, 406 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code in C.R. No.I-230 of 2015 of registered on 28.5.2015 at the instance of one Gaurav N. Oberoi with the Kalwa Police station, Thane. It is the case of the prosecution that the complainant is working as a Manager in one Ujjevan Financial Services Pvt. Ltd.. The business of the company was of financial services. The applicant-accused was also working in the Kalwa branch of the company. She has produced 12 bogus persons to obtain loan in one Rishta category of loans. She has misappropriated an amount of Rs.2,40,000/- in the said category of 12 persons. She also misappropriated property to the tune of Rs.165,000/- of 11 persons. She did not deposit the EMI amounts of nearly 30 debtors who had given to her

for repayment of their loans and thus, a total amount of Rs.462,000/- is misappropriated.

2. The learned Counsel for the applicant-accused has submitted that the applicant-accused is working at a very low level of clerk. There is a process of verification of persons' identification, which was used while sanctioning loan to those 12 persons. The applicant-accused is innocent and she is a woman. So, she is to be protected.

3. Learned Prosecutor has opposed the application.

4. After going through the FIR and the manner in which the offence is committed, I am of the view that custody of the applicant is required to unearth the modus operandi. Hence, the Anticipatory Bail Application is rejected.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)