

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.701 OF 2021

(SNEHA DHANRAJ RAMTEKE @ SNEHA UTTAM KHANDEKAR....VS.. STATE OF MAH. THR. PSO
PS, GONDIA(RURAL), DIST. GONDIA)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Ms Sejal Lakhani, Advocate for Applicant.
Shri V.A.Thakre, A.P.P. for Non-applicant/State.
Shri S.K.Utwal & Shri S.K.Soni, Advs. to Assist Prosecution.

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR, J.
DATED : FEBRUARY 18, 2022.

This is an application filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail in Crime No.428 of 2021, registered on 30/09/2021 with Police Station, Gondia (Rural) on a complaint of one Sujata Vijay Bansod against the applicant and six other accused persons for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 504 and 507 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the complainant Mrs.Sujata Vijay Bansod lodged a complaint alleging therein that the present applicant along with main accused Uttam Mohan Khandekar by giving false promise of employment in Railway Department, extracted money from the husband of the complainant and her nephew. It is further alleged that there are many persons like the complainant who are the victims of the present applicant

and other accused persons from whom the accused persons have extracted money on the said pretext.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the non-applicant/ State.

4. Ms Sejal Lakhani, learned counsel for the applicant submits that she is wife of main accused Uttam Mohan Khandekar, however, she is staying separately from last three months and there is nothing to show that she has played any role in the alleged offence. The learned counsel for the applicant states that on the date of the incident she was not along with other accused persons and thereby she is claiming *alibi*.

5. It is submitted that this Court had protected the applicant by granting ad-interim anticipatory bail vide order dated 25/10/2021 and thereafter on many occasions, as directed by this Court, she had attended the Police Station. She, therefore, prays that the interim protection may be confirmed by allowing the present application.

6. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. Shri Thakre strongly opposed the application and points out from the case diary that sufficient material is collected against the applicant and there is statement of a witness, wherein the

witness has categorically stated that he has paid Rs.3,00,000/- to the applicant and the applicant helped him to fill up the form for employment in Railways. It is further stated in the statement that the amount was paid to the applicant in presence of main accused Uttam Khandekar.

7. After going through the case diary and the contents of the FIR, *prima-facie*, I am of the opinion that there is material showing involvement of the applicant. Accordingly, I am not inclined to confirm the ad-interim anticipatory bail granted by this Court vide order dated 25/10/2021.

The application is **rejected**.

JUDGE

RRaut..