IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 490 OF 2025

Shravani Abhishek Wadkar ...Applicant
Versus
The State Of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Adv. Rounak Naik, Advocate for the Applicant.
Ms. Rutuja A. Ambekar, APP for the State.

Adv. Seema Pandey i/b. Adv. Pankaj Pandey, Advocate for intevernor.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.
DATED : 27 FEBRUARY 2025

P.C.:

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (in short 'BNSS") in Crime No.I-2100/2024 registered with Mumbra Police Station against the Applicant for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 406, 409, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the informant deposited a sum of Rs. 64,89,600/- with the company owned by the present Applicant and her husband. Only a sum of Rs. 18,26,400/- was repaid, and the balance amount of Rs. 46,63,200/- remains unpaid. As a result, the F.I.R. has been lodged against both the accused, who are husband and wife. Accused No. 1 is Abhishek Maruti Wadkar, who is the husband

of the Applicant.

3. According to the learned APP, the Accused No.1, husband of the present Applicant, has fled to the United Kingdom and is currently untraceable. However, he remains in contact with the present Applicant through online mode.

4. The learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that the entire transaction of monies paid by the Informant was with a company called Gifting Treasure Utility Service Pvt. Ltd. (GTUSPL). The business of this company involves providing gift coupons, and the directors of this company are Accused No. 1 (the husband of the Applicant) and one Mr. Dipankar Poddar. The present Applicant, except for being the wife of Accused No. 1, has no role in the operations of the said company. Although the Applicant was previously a director of Gifting Treasure Pvt. Ltd. along with her husband, she is no longer associated with the company.

5. He further submits that the present Applicant is not in contact with Accused No. 1 (her husband) and is unaware of his current whereabouts. In fact, she has filed a missing person complaint with the police station regarding her husband. While there have been email communications between the Applicant and Accused No. 1, these contacts were solely for the limited purpose of ascertaining the

whereabouts of Accused No. 1. Except for an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- being transferred from an account likely handled by Accused No. 1 (her husband), the Applicant has no involvement in the matter.

6. He submits that the Applicant is ready to cooperate with the police and has already attended the office of the Investigating Officer at least five times.

7. The present Anticipatory Bail Application is being opposed on the ground that the Applicant is attempting to take advantage of the fact that she is a lady and claims to be unaware of the whereabouts of her husband, Accused No. 1. The information available with the Investigating Officer suggests that a sum of Rs. 46,00,000/- has been transferred to the account of the present Applicant. Additionally, the Applicant has been in contact with Accused No. 1 (her husband) via email. The Applicant has not cooperated with the police in providing further details about Accused No. 1.

8. Initially, the Applicant informed the police that she had no connection with the company floated by Accused No. 1. However, the police discovered that the Applicant is a director in at least one company, known as GTPL. It is submitted that, in order to trace the trail of the money, it is necessary for the present Applicant to be called in for interrogation.

9. I have heard counsel for both the sides and have gone through the documents produced before me, including the F.I.R. and certain other documents. Admittedly, Accused No.1 is a husband of the Applicant. He has not applied for any kind of Anticipatory Bail Application, and as per the information provided by the Investigating Officer, he has fled outside the jurisdiction of this Country namely to the United Kingdom.

10. When the Applicant first met the Investigating Officer, she claimed that she was not aware of the transactions and was not a partner/director in any of the companies floated by her husband. However, the present Applicant, being the wife of Accused No. 1, is, as per the knowledge of the Investigating Officer, in contact with Accused No. 1 via email. There is a strong possibility that the present Applicant is also in touch with him through voice calls. A sum of Rs. 46,63,200/- is payable by the Accused to the Informant. The Applicant has not cooperated with the Investigating Officer in carrying out the investigation. It has also been established that she is a director of GTPL.

11. Taking into consideration the facts of the present proceedings, I am of the view that there is no merits in this Anticipatory Bail Application. Hence, the same stands rejected.

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)