

Andreza

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION (BAIL) NO. 60 OF 2021
WITH
CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION NO. 51 OF 2021
AND
CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION (BAIL) NO. 61 OF 2021**

**CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION (BAIL) NO. 60 OF 2021
WITH
CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION NO. 51 OF 2021**

Smita Durgaprasad Narvekar	... Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
State, Police Inspector, Attached to Mapusa Police Station, Mapusa & anr.	... Respondents

A N D

CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION (BAIL) NO. 61 OF 2021

Durgaprasad Sainath Narvekar	Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
State, Police Inspector, Attached to Mapusa Police Station, Mapusa & anr.	Respondents

Mr. Gaurish Agni, Advocate for the Applicants.
Mr. S. G. Bhohe, Public Prosecutor for the Respondents-State.

CORAM: MANISH PITALE, J
DATED: 24th February 2022

ORAL ORDER

1. These two applications for grant of anticipatory bail are filed by husband and wife in the backdrop of offences registered against them at the behest of the mother of the husband.

2. The complainant has made allegations against her own son and daughter in law alleging that they indulged in activities leading to offences under the Indian Penal Code (IPC). On the basis of the complaint, FIR no.81/2021 stood registered against the Applicants for offences under Sections 342, 504, 323 and 341 of IPC and later Section 380 of the IPC was added,.

3. Considering the peculiar facts of this case where the grievance of the complainant appears to have arisen from a family dispute, while issuing notice for final disposal on these applications on 01.09.2021, this Court granted ad-interim relief in favour of the Applicants directing that the Applicants may not be arrested subject to their appearance before the Police Station on 03.09.2021 and thereafter as and when the Investigating Officer would call them.

4. The interim relief in favour of the Applicants has been operating for about six months now.

5. The learned Public Prosecutors appearing in these applications, on instructions, have made a statement that the Applicants have indeed co-operated with the investigation. In fact, it is stated that the complainant herself i.e. the mother of the Applicant in CRMAB NO. 61 of 2021, has failed to come forward for recording of her statement.

6. In these circumstances, this Court is convinced that these two applications deserve to be granted.

7. In view of the above, the interim orders granted in favour of the Applicants are confirmed and these applications are allowed subject to

the Applicants continuing to co-operate with the investigation and making themselves available before the Investigating Officer as and when called.

8. Applications stand disposed of.

MANISH PITALE, J