



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.665 OF 2025

TARANNUM TAUHIR KHAN

...APPLICANT

VS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...RESPONDENT

...

Adv. Jaiswar Arvind Kumar for the Applicant.

Adv. Anand S. Shalgaonkar, APP for the State.

...

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATED : MARCH 7, 2025

P.C.:

1. This is the application filed by the applicant for granting her anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in the event of arrest in connection with C. R. No. 966 of 2022 registered with Mankhurd Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 385, 452, 504 and 506 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the present applicant till now has filed three anticipatory bail applications before the Sessions Court. Those three anticipatory bail applications were rejected by order dated 18 August 2022, 14 September 2022 and 30 January 2025 respectively. Thereafter the present anticipatory bail application has been filed by the present applicant.

3. The case of the prosecution has been narrated in the complaint which forms part of the FIR. The FIR has been lodged on 6 August 2022. The applicant is absconding from the date of lodging the FIR. It is submitted that the first informant runs a ration shop at Mankhurd. One Mr. Akbar Ali Khan is the assistant of first informant. On 5 August, 2022 the informant opened his ration shop along with his assistant Mr. Akbar Khan for making calculations. At 7.00 pm., the accused persons came to the shop of the informant. They had masked their face with clothes and pretended themselves to be “reporter”. They asked the first informant whether he was selling wheat and rice in black. As the informant denied these facts, the said accused demanded a sum of Rs.25,000/- as a monthly installment. The accused also threatened the informant that if the said amount was not paid the team of the accused will close down the shop of the first informant. At that time the assistant of the first informant was capturing the entire episode on his mobile. While the assistant of the first informant was photographing the video of the entire incident, the accused snatched the mobile phone of the assistant of the first informant. Hence, the first informant dialed 100 number. Thereafter the police came and took away the applicant along with them. Thereafter, the complaint was lodged by the informant and accordingly a crime has been registered.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that after rejection of

the pre-arrest bail applications filed by the applicant, the police have not taken any action against the present applicant. Only once, the applicant was called to the police station and thereafter there is no notice given to the applicant by the police to attend the police station. The applicant has not committed any kind of crime and the police does not require the custody of the present applicant.

5. The learned APP opposed the present application of the applicant. He submits that if the pre-arrest bail is granted to the applicant, she would tamper with the evidence. Three times pre-arrest bail application of the applicant was rejected by the Sessions Court.

6. I have heard counsel for both the sides and I have gone through the FIR and documents produced before me. The applicant has not produced on record the details of their earlier complaint in which she was called by the Crime Branch. Though informed, she has not produced on record the copy of the alleged statement recorded by the police officer. *Prima facie* there are no material produced by the applicant/accused to show that she was called by P.I. on 13 January 2024. The applicant has not produced before me any factual thing about change in circumstances. As per FIR, it seems the *modus operandi* of the applicant, first to demand money giving threats, while the colleague of applicant tried to photograph the entire incident on her mobile, and thereafter, again give threats to lodge complaint for

outraging modesty, and then again demand money. I find there is no merit in the anticipatory bail application of the applicant and the same stands rejected.

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)