

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 93 OF 2016

Smt. Nirmala Vishnu Bhondave ... Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Kuldeep S. Patil for Applicant.

Mr. Rahul S. Kadam for Respondent Nos.2 & 3.

Ms. Rutuja Ambekar, APP for Respondent – State.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE : JANUARY 4, 2019.

P.C. :

. The complainant has taken out this Application for cancellation of bail granted to the Respondent Nos.2 & 3.

2. Heard. Mr. Patil, the learned Counsel for Applicant at length. He would try to impress upon the Court to demonstrate as to how the Respondent Nos. 2 & 3 – Accused persons are not entitled for the pre-arrest bail. If the contention of the learned Counsel for Applicant are appreciated based on the reasons recorded by the learned Sessions Judge while allowing the pre-arrest Bail Application, the repeated consenting act

on the part of the Applicant – Complainant speaks of voluntary participation in the transaction of the land by the complainant. The order of grant of bail is supported by the good reasons.

3. That being so, in my opinion, no case for cancellation of bail is made out. As such, the Application fails. Hence rejected.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)