



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.904/2025

NANDINI SANJAY RANRUI

...APPLICANT

VS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...RESPONDENT

...

Adv. Purushottam Chavan a/w Someshwar Pawale Patil i/b Sachin
Padye for the Applicant.

Adv. Supriya Kak, APP for the Respondent State.

HC V. T. Vibhute Pandharpur City Police Station.

...

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATED : APRIL 2, 2025

P.C.:

1. Applicant/accused preferred this application for pre-arrest bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Crime No. 100/2025 registered with Pandharpur City police station for the offences Punishable under Section 306 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. As per the complaint filed, an FIR has been lodged. The applicant is the only accused in the FIR. The role of the applicant has been mentioned in the FIR.

3. Mr. Chavan, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is a lady, who is a naturopathy and physiotherapy doctor,

who had visited the house of the first informant, in order to give treatment to the sister-in-law of the first informant. She attended for few days, thereafter, the applicant had to visit Kolhapur since there were wedding plans to be decided of the applicant. As she had been to the Kolhapur, an FIR was lodged by the first informant on the allegations that certain gold jewellery of her was missing from the cupboard which was situated in the bedroom, where the treatment was conducted by the applicant to the sister-in-law of the first informant.

4. He submits that the FIR was filed after five days. The police have not investigated the matter properly as they should have also investigated about the crime with the sister-in-law of the first informant. It is also pertinent to note that sum of Rs.26,000/- was due from the sister-in-law of the first informant, to the present applicant being the charges for treatment being given to her by visiting the house of the first informant. In order to avoid to pay the professional fees of the doctor, the first informant, on false grounds, has filed the present FIR. He submits that the applicant is a doctor by profession and there are no antecedents reported against the applicant. The applicant is ready to co-operate with police. Therefore, the custody of the present applicant is not at all necessary.

5. The learned APP submits that the gold ornaments of the first informant was missing from the cupboard situated in the bedroom.

When the first informant realized that the gold ornaments are missing, suspiciously during the said period, the present applicant had stopped coming to the house of the first informant, in order to give treatment to the sister-in-law of the first informant. Therefore, the custody of the present applicant would be necessary in order to complete the investigation.

6. I have heard the counsel for both the sides and have gone through the documents on record.

7. The Applicant is a lady doctor of naturopathy and physiotherapy. The applicant was invited by the first informant to her house in order to give treatment to the sister-in-law of the applicant. The applicant visited the house of the first informant on various occasions in order to give treatment to the sister-in-law of the first informant. As per the case of the applicant, the professional fees of Rs. 26,000/- has not been paid by the sister-in-law of the first informant. As the applicant travelled to Kolhapur since there were family plans in order to fix her marriage, it since that according to the first informant after the applicant travelled to Kolhapur, the first informant's jewellery was missing from her house. It is the case of the first informant that the keys of the said cupboard was kept in the bedroom and there is an allegation that the applicant must have used that keys to open the cupboard and then the safe and has robbed the jewellery.

8. According to me, there was no reason for the first informant to keep keys of the cupboard which are visible to any person. Presuming the keys were kept in the bedroom where it can be seen any person visiting the bedroom. It is nobodies case that the applicant was alone in the bedroom. The applicant used to come for a limited time in order to give a treatment as a physiotherapist to the sister-in-law of the first informant. Therefore, at all times, at least the sister-in-law of the first informant was present along with the applicant in the said bedroom. The learned APP is not able to show me any kind of an evidence at this stage to show the role of the present applicant in the crime. There are no antecedents reported against the present applicant. Hence, according to me the case is made out to grant the interim protection to the present applicant. Hence, I pass the following order.

ORDER

(a) **The anticipatory bail application is allowed.**

(b) In the event of arrest in connection with C.R.No.100/2025 registered with Pandharpur City Police Station, the applicant shall be released on bail, on furnishing PR. bond to the extent of Rs.30,000/- with one or two sureties of the like amount.

(c) The applicant shall attend the concerned police station on 7/4/2025 between 11.00a.m. to 1.00

p.m. and thereafter, as and when called for.

(d) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with facts of case so as to dissuade her from disclosing the facts to Court or any Police Officer and shall not tamper with evidence.

(e) The applicant shall furnish details of her residential address, contact number and email address to the Investigating Officer.

9. **The anticipatory bail application is disposed off as allowed.**

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)