

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1270 OF 2023

Meenaz w/o. Rais Ahmed Shaikh and Another ...Applicants
vs.
The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Satyaram Gaud, for the Applicant
Mr. S.H. Yadav, APP, for the Respondent/State.
Mr. R.B. Shendge, API, Mumbra police station.

CORAM : N. J. JAMADAR, J.
DATE : OCTOBER 17, 2023

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State.
2. This application is preferred seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with C.R. No. 172 of 2023 registered at Mumbra police station for the offences punishable under sections 420 and 406 read with 34 of Indian penal Code, 1860.
3. When the application was listed before this Court on 4th May, 2023 this Court was persuaded to grant interim bail ascribing reasons.
4. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that pursuant to the direction in the said order, the applicant has appeared before the Investigating Officer and cooperated with the investigation. It was further submitted that the first informant had

and the victims had transactions with the husband and son of the applicant Nos. 1. The applicant No. 2 is the sister of the applicant No. 1.

5. I have perused the allegations in the first information report.

6. Prima facie, the allegations appear to be against the husband and son of the applicant No. 1. The material on record prima facie does not establish the nexus between the amount which has been credited to the account of the applicant and the amounts which the first informant and the victims were allegedly made to part with.

7. In this view of the matter, at this length of time, when the investigation is complete for all intent and purpose and charge-sheet has been filed against the principal accused, the custodial interrogation of the applicants does not seem to be warranted.

8. I am, therefore, inclined to make the order of interim bail absolute.

9. The applicants shall regularly attend the proceedings before the jurisdictional Court.

10. It is clarified that these prima facie observations are confined to determine entitlement to pre-arrest bail only.

Application disposed.

(N. J. JAMADAR, J.)