

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2680 OF 2024

Shubhangi Dattatray Jagtap

...Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

SHRIKANT
SHRINIVAS
MALANI

Digitally signed by
SHRIKANT
SHRINIVAS MALANI
Date: 2024.10.04
12:09:47 +0530

- Mr. Ganesh Bhujbal, for Applicant.
- Mr. Prasanna P. Malshe, APP for Respondent.
- Mr. Divyesh K. Jain, for Informant.
- Mr. Namdev L. Tawde, PSI, Jejuri Police Station.

CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.

DATE : 03rd OCTOBER, 2024.

P. C. :

1. Heard, Mr. Bhujbal learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Malshe, learned APP for the respondent – State.

2. The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with First Information Report No.0254 of 2024, dated 29.06.2024, registered at Police Station Jejuri, District Pune, for offences under Sections 386 and 387 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC).

3. The informant approached the police, claiming that huge amount of ₹ 24,30,000/- was extorted from him by the named accused person in the present case and that the applicant herein was party to such a conspiracy. It was alleged that the applicant called the informant to a particular flat on the pretext of showing him the said flat. She allegedly started getting physically

close to him and thereafter, upon receiving a phone call, she left the applicant. Subsequently, the applicant came to know that a video clip was prepared recording the said incident of physical contact between the applicant and the informant and on that basis the named accused person extorted huge amount of money from the applicant.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that in the present case, the applicant was not named as an accused in the FIR. It is further submitted that her name appears to have been subsequently added. There is nothing to indicate that the applicant acted in connivance with the named accused person, in order to extort the huge amount from the applicant. It is further submitted that even as per the informant, the incident of the video being recorded had taken place some time in July, 2020 and the FIR was registered much later in June, 2024. On this basis, it was submitted that this Court may grant relief to the applicant, as she is ready to cooperate with the investigation.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP has vehemently opposed the present application. He submitted that clear and specific allegations have been leveled against the applicant. The video clip on the basis of which huge amount was extorted from the informant was prepared with the active involvement of the applicant and therefore, there is enough material to link

the applicant with the allegation of extortion in the present case. It is further submitted that the applicant has two criminal antecedents and this fact may also be taken into consideration.

6. As regards criminal antecedents, the learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the offences registered therein have no similarity or connection with the alleged incident in the present case. He submitted that in the said FIR also her name was added subsequently.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions in the light of the material placed on record. The allegation made by the informant in the present case specifically shows the involvement of the applicant in preparation of the video clip that formed the basis for extortion of huge amount from the informant. Although the specific allegation of extortion was made against the named accused person, the video clip on the basis of which such extortion was committed by the named accused person, clearly involved the applicant herein. Even if the incident of recording of the video clip pertained to July, 2020, that in itself cannot inure to the benefit of the applicant because, according to the informant, the video clip was used over a period of time by the co-accused person to extort huge amount from the informant.

8. This Court is of the opinion that the statement, leading to registration of the FIR itself, describes in detail the involvement of the

applicant. The fact that the applicant has criminal antecedents can be said to be an additional reason not to show any indulgence in her favour.

9. Hence, the application is dismissed.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)