

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 244 OF 2019

Mrs. Yogeshri Manik Kumbhar

.... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.... Respondents

Mr. Balwant V. Salunkhe for Applicant.

Mr. Amey Mahadik i/b. Tanvi G. Tapkire, for Respondent Nos.2 to 12.

Ms. Pallavi N. Dabholkar, APP for the State/Respondent No.1.

CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.

DATE : 22th MARCH, 2021

P.C. :

1. This is an application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the Respondent Nos.2 to 12 by order dated 03/06/2019 and confirmed by order dated 27/06/2019 passed by the Sessions Court at Sangli in A.B.A.No.646 of 2019 in connection with C.R.No. 293 of 2019 dated 31/05/2019.

2. Heard Shri. Balwant Salunkhe, learned counsel for the applicant, Shri. Amey Mahadik, learned counsel for the

Respondent Nos.2 to 12 and Ms. Pallavi Dabholkar, learned APP for the State/Respondent No.1.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant mainly submitted that, bail should be cancelled because the complaint is given by the informant Smt. Yogeshri Kumbhar to the police officer of Jat police station, Sangli on 04/06/2019. According to the learned counsel for the applicant this complaint was given during the pendency of anticipatory bail application before the Sessions Court, after the interim order was passed and before final order was passed.

4. I have perused that complaint. It is in respect of an unknown person allegedly threatening the first informant. That complaint was given in June, 2019. Beyond that, there is nothing to support the allegations that the applicants are threatening the first informant. The allegations in that complaint dated 04/06/2019 are vague. They are against unknown person and for that, bail granted to all the applicants cannot be cancelled. No case for interference in the order passed by the sessions court is made out. The incident is old and no specific allegations are levelled against the applicants in respect of issuance of threats to the first

informant with supporting material.

5. In this view of the matter, application cannot be allowed and is rejected.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)