

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

**ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3105 OF 2024**

Surekha Pandurang Bhore

...Applicant

**Versus**

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

\*\*\*

- Mr. Shreekrishna More, (Through V.C.), for Applicant.
- Mr. Tanveer G. Khan, APP for Respondent.
- Mr. Vithal Takale, API, Yerwada Police Station.

\*\*\*

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.**

**DATE : 22<sup>nd</sup> NOVEMBER, 2024.**

**P. C. :**

1. Heard, Mr. More, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Khan, learned APP for respondent – State.

2. The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with First Information Report No.0592 of 2024, dated 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2024, registered at Police Station Yerwada, District Pune, for offences under Sections 471, 470, 468, 465, 200 and 199 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC).

3. The informant in the present case claimed that the applicant had used forged affidavits of her relatives, one of whom was dead and other was suffering from paralysis, while applying for measurement of a particular piece of land in respect of which litigation was already pending. It is on this basis of such allegations that the FIR has been registered.

SHRIKANT  
SHRINIVAS  
MALANI

Digitally signed by  
SHRIKANT  
SHRINIVAS MALANI  
Date: 2024.11.22  
13:47:24 +0530

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the FIR has its genesis in a property dispute involving members of a family of the applicant. It is submitted that the allegations pertain only to an application seeking measurement of a piece of land and since the applicant is a woman and she is ready to cooperate with the investigation, this Court may grant relief.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP submits that specific allegations have been made about forgery of signatures and preparation of affidavits of persons, who were dead and suffering from serious health condition, thereby showing the ingredients of the alleged offences.

6. Having heard the submissions, this Court is inclined to allow the application. The applicant is a woman and she is ready to cooperate with the investigation. The statement of the informant, leading to registration of the FIR, shows that apart from the subject FIR, there are other cases registered in the context of a property dispute concerning the family of the applicant and the informant. The genesis of the FIR appears to be a property dispute. Even if there are allegations of forgery and false affidavits being placed on record alongwith an application for measurement, this Court is inclined to grant relief, for the reason that the evidence in the present case is necessarily documentary in nature and the applicant being a woman is ready to cooperate with the investigation.

7. It is to be noted that while the alleged incident of forgery took place in February, 2024, the FIR has been registered about 7 months later, on 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2024.

8. In view of the above, the application is allowed in the following terms:

- (A) In the event the applicant is arrested in connection with FIR No.0592 of 2024, dated 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2024, registered at Police Station Yerwada, District Pune, she shall be released on bail, on furnishing PR Bond of ₹25,000/- with one or two sureties in the like amount.
- (B) The applicant shall appear before the Investigating Officer on 25<sup>th</sup> November, 2024, between 10:00 a.m. and 12:00 noon and thereafter as and when called by the Investigating Officer.
- (C) The applicant shall cooperate with the investigation.
- (D) The applicant shall not tamper with the evidence in any manner. She shall not influence the informant, witnesses or any other persons concerned with the case.

9. Needless to say, violation of any of the aforesaid conditions would make the applicant liable to face proceedings for cancellation of anticipatory

bail.

10. It is also clarified that the observations made in this order are limited to the question of grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant in the present application and that the Trial Court shall proceed further, without being influenced by the observations made in this order.

11. The application is disposed of.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)