

Anand

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

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2042 OF 2019

Ravikant Daroga Singh .Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra .Respondent

WITH

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1999 OF 2019

Shweta Devesh Siwal .Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra .Respondent

Mr. Dinesh Tiwari a/w Mr. Mikhail Dey, Mr. Swapnil Ambure,
Mr. Ansh Karnawat & Ms Mayuri Mayekar i/b. Dinesh Tiwari &
Associates,, Advocate, for the Applicants in both matters
Mr. A. R. Kapadnis, APP, for the Respondent – State in both matters
Mr. Gyanoba Indrale, PSI, Malvani Police Station, Mumbai present

CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.

DATE : 26.07.2019

P.C.

. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. By these Applications, the Applicants seek their
enlargement on bail in connection with C. R. No. 511 of 2019 registered
with the Malvani Police Station, Mumbai, for the alleged offences

punishable under Sections 354, 506, 509 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Perused the papers. According to the Complainant, aged 22 years, she had come from Uttar Pradesh to work in Mumbai, as an artist in the television industry. The Applicant – Ravikant Singh is the Director of web series and the Applicant – Shweta Siwal, an Assistant Director, working with the Applicant - Ravikant Singh. The Complainant has alleged that she was introduced by one Nikhil to the Applicant - Ravikant Singh. Nikhil is stated to have told her that there was work for her in a web series, pursuant to which she met the Applicant - Ravikant Singh, on 07.06.2019. The Complainant has alleged that the Applicant - Ravikant Singh told her that he was making a comedy web series and took her audition and later selected her for the same. She has alleged that the Applicant – Ravikant called her on 08.06.2019 and told her that in the role, a girl has to kiss a boy and was also required to do a sex scene, to which she told the Applicant that she will only do the kissing scene. She has further stated that the Applicant - Ravikant Singh told her that he would give her scene, with which she was comfortable and was told to come on 09.06.2019 to sign the contract. According to the Complainant, she was hurriedly made to sign

the same, hence, she could not read the contract properly. She has further stated that she reached the venue on 12.06.2019 and shot for the scenes as told. She has further stated that on 13.06.2019, the Applicants - Ravikant Singh and Shweta told her to lie on the bed and told her that the person doing the role of her brother-in-law would come near her, touch her legs and lift her nightie, which she refused to do. She has alleged that she was forcibly made to do the said scene against her wish. She has also alleged that she was asked to deliver some sexy dialogues, which she did against her wish. She has stated that both the Applicants promised her that she will not be compelled again to do any work against her wish. She has further stated that on 14.06.2019, she was again compelled by the Applicants to wear a thin nighty and do an intimate scene with another girl and when she objected, the Applicants compelled her to do the scene. She has narrated the said incident in detail in her FIR. She has further stated that when she refused to go for the shooting, the Applicant – Shweta told her that she could not leave the shooting midway, as she had signed a contract and she would have to pay Rs. 40,00,000/- and even threatened to go to the police. Pursuant thereto, the Complainant lodged the aforesaid FIR. The Complainant has alleged that her signature was taken on a bogus contract against her wish and she was threatened to do semi nude scenes. Pursuant to the

FIR, the Applicants were arrested on 25.06.2019. Learned counsel for the Applicants states that the Applicants have handed over the original contract as well as the video clips to the police, who have seized the same under a panchanama. Learned counsel for the Applicants on instructions states that the Applicants will not enforce the contract entered into between the Complainant and them. Statement accepted.

4. In the facts, continued detention of the Applicants is not warranted. Accordingly, the Applications are allowed and the Applicants are enlarged on bail on the following terms & conditions :-

ORDER

(i) The Applicants be released on **cash bail** in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- each, for a period of six weeks;

(ii) The Applicants shall within the said period of six weeks, furnish P. R. Bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- each with one or two sureties in the like amount;

(iii) The Applicants shall attend the concerned police station on every Saturday between 10.00 a. m. and 12.00 noon till the filing of the charge-sheet;

(iv) The Applicants shall not tamper with the evidence or attempt to influence or contact the complainant, witnesses or any person

concerned with the case;

(v) The Applicants to co-operate with the conduct of the trial.

5. The Applications are allowed in the aforesaid terms and are accordingly disposed of.

6. It is made clear that the observations made herein are *prima facie*, and the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, in accordance with law, uninfluenced by the observations made in this order.

All concerned to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

(REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.)