**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

931 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 900 OF 2025

Sheetal Sudhakar Motinge
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra
...
Mr. Ghanekar Nilesh S. and Mr. Rothe Rajesh F, Advocate for Applicant
Mr. K. K. Naik, APP for Respondent/State
Mr. A. A. Aute, Advocate for assist to APP
...
**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1859 OF 2025
IN BA/900/2025**

Natha Apparao Kakde
VERSUS
Sheetal Sudhakar Motinge And Another
…
Mr. Avinash Anandrao Aute, Advocate for Applicant
Mr. Ghanekar Nilesh S. and Mr. Rothe Rajesh F, Advocate for respondent No.1
Mr. K. K. Naik, APP for Respondent/State
….

CORAM : SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.
RESERVED ON : 19.09.2025
PRONOUNCED ON : 17.10.2025

ORDER :-

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1859 OF 2025
IN BA/900/2025**

1. This is an application seeking permission to assist the APP during the course of hearing of Bail Application No.900 of 2025. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed in terms of prayer clause ‘b’ and disposed of.

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 900 OF 2025

1. Heard.

2. This is an application for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in connection with Crime No.13 of 2025, registered at Jinsi Police Station, District Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3 and 4 of the M.P.I.D. Act.

3. The learned advocate for the applicant pointed out the report in which the informant averred that he came in contact with the present applicant through one Vinod Sant, Manager of Shankar Nagari Sahakari Bank, Pundliknagar Branch, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar. The applicant introduced herself as the Manager of Quick Start 24 Group (Enlife Capsure LLP Enlife Multistate Pvt. Ltd. Company) Jalna Road Branch, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar. The applicant told the informant that Harshal Gandhi and Pratik Shah from Ahmadabad, Gujarat were the owners/partners of the said company and many influential people had invested in the said company. The applicant told the informant that the company also had another branch at N-7, CIDCO, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, where Vithal Tandale was the manager. She further told the informant that the company would pay 3%

monthly dividend on investments. Believing her, the informant and his relatives invested a total amount of Rs.21,50,000/- in the company. Later, the informant came to know that the Jalna Road branch was closed. Thereafter, he met the applicant at the N-7 branch, but even after promising to return the money, she did not do so. The informant then came to know that the company, through the applicant, had collected money from 700–800 investors and cheated them. Therefore, the report was lodged.

4. The learned advocate for the applicant submitted that the applicant is a lady and she has been falsely implicated in the crime. The applicant has roots in the society and she will not flee away from the trial. The trial will take a long period. The applicant was merely an employee of the said company and had no intention or motive to cheat anyone. The learned advocate for the applicant relied upon the following authorities and prayed that bail may be granted to the applicant.

(i) ***Sharad Kumar Vs. CBI***, in Bail Application No.1565 of 2011 order dated 28.11.2011.

(ii) ***Sanjay Chandra Vs. CBI,*** in Criminal Appeal No.2178 of 2011 (arising out of SLP (Crl). No.5650 of 2011.

(iii). ***P. Chidambaram Vs. Directorate of Enforcement, Manu/SC/1670/2019.***

5. The learned APP for the State and learned advocate assisting to the prosecution strongly opposed the application and submitted that the applicant is involved in a serious crime. It is alleged that she, along with the co-accused, cheated more than 800 person. There is direct involvement of the applicant, as she executed agreements with the investors. Considering the huge amount and a serious nature of the crime, if the applicant is released on bail, she will certainly pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the evidence. It is prayed to reject the application.

6. Perused the charge-sheet, particularly the report and statements of witnesses. The applicant is involved in a serious economic crime, having cheated more than 800 persons for Rs.21,50,000/-. The absconding accused, Pratik Shah and Harshal Gandhi have transferred some amounts to the bank account of the applicant. Thus there is reliable material against the applicant. Considering all these aspects, if the applicant is released on bail, she will certainly pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the evidence. No case is made out to allow the application on the principle that bail is rule and jail is the exception. The Bail Application is rejected.

[SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.]

HRJadhav