

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

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3447 OF 2025

Pratiksha Siddharth Gandakush

.... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

.... Respondent

Mr. Ramnik Pawar a/w Adv. S. V. Mahamulkar , Mr. Rahul H. Gupta a/w Mr. Parvej Nadaf, Ms. Dhanashri Jagdale, Mr. Aditya S. Hutagikar, Mr. Indrajit V. Patil and Mr. Prathamesh Kadam, Advocate for the Applicant.

Ms. Veera Shinde, A.P.P., for the Respondent – State.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 10th OCTOBER, 2025.

P.C. :

1. The Applicant is seeking regular bail in connection with C.R. No.169 of 2025 registered with Satara City Police Station, District: Satara, for the offences punishable under Sections 316(5), 318(4), 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, “BNS Act”) along with Section 3 and 4 of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors (In Financial Establishment) Act, 1999, (for short, “MPID Act”).

2. It is prosecution’s case that co-accused induced the first

informant and other investors to invest the amount in their company with promise of lucrative returns, but they did not pay neither the amount nor the returns. The allegations against the Applicant are that she was employee of the said company and looked after the cash transaction with co-accused.

3. It is contention of learned counsel for the Applicant that the Investigation Officer has recorded the statement of 54 witnesses, but not a single witness has stated against the present Applicant. The Applicant was working as a H.R. in the said Company. She never induced any investors to invest the amount. The Applicant is behind bars for more than nine months. Investigation is completed and charge-sheet has been filed. Hence, requested to allow the application.

4. It is contention of learned APP that the Applicant was working as H.R. As per prosecution case, Rs.30,000/- was transferred in the account of the Applicant. She had purchased the scooter from the said amount, it shows her involvement in the said crime, and requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel, perused F.I.R. and documents produced on record.

6. As per prosecution's case, Rs.30,000/- was transferred in the Applicant's account and she had purchased scooter from it. The Applicant is behind bars for more than nine months. Investigation is completed and charge-sheet has been filed. The main allegations are against the co-accused. Considering these facts, I pass following order:

ORDER

- i. Application is allowed.
- ii. The Applicant be released on bail in connection with C.R. No.169 of 2025 registered with Satara City Police Station, District: Satara, on furnishing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one or two sureties in the like amount.
- iii. The Applicant shall attend the concerned police station as and when required.
- iv. The Applicant shall remain present before the trial Court on each date unless exempted by the Trial Court.
- v. The Applicant shall not tamper with the evidence or attempt to influence or contact the complainant,

witness or any person concerned with the case.

- vi. The Applicant shall inform his latest place of residence and mobile number immediately after being released and/or change of residence or mobile details, if any, from time to time to the Investigating Officer.
7. The application is allowed in the aforesaid terms and is accordingly disposed off.
8. It is made clear that the above observations are made only for the purpose of granting bail and the Trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits in accordance with law and uninfluenced by the observations made in this order.
9. All concerned to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)