

sg

14.aba1834-25.docx

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No.1834 of 2025

Shruti Sadolikar-Katkar

Age: 73 years, Occ: Retired,

R/at: D-504, Lloyds Street,

Sangamnagar, Wadala (E),

Mumbai 400 037

... Applicant

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra

2. The State of Uttar Pradesh
through Investigation Officer
(In FIR No.45 of 2021 registered
with Kaiserbaug Police Station,
Lucknow (E), State of Uttar Pradesh)

3. The Public Prosecutor
(Sessions Court of Lucknow,
State of Uttar Pradesh)

... Respondents

Mr Niranjan Mundargi, i/b. Meghdeep Oak, for the applicant.

Mr Swapnil Pednekar, APP, for the respondent/State.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 7 July 2025.

P.C.:

. Liberty to file the service affidavit.

2. Heard Mr Niranjan Mundargi, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant; and Mr Swapnil Pednekar, the learned APP representing respondent No.1/State.

3. In this application, the applicant has approached this Court projecting extreme urgency in the matter for the reason that she apprehended arrest in connection with CR No.45 of 2021, registered at Kaiserbaug Police Station, Lucknow East, Uttar Pradesh, for the offences punishable under Sections 409, 420, 120-B, read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. The learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is seeking limited relief of protection until she can approach the competent Court of jurisdiction for seeking anticipatory bail in connection with the aforesaid crime registered against her.

5. The learned APP emphasized that since the FIR is registered at Kaiserbaug Police Station, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, really speaking, respondent No.1/State would not have much to say in the matter. He suggests that even if this Court is inclined to grant relief, it may impose appropriate conditions to prevent misuse of the relief.

6. It is a settled position in law that the limited relief of protection can be granted to the applicant, only to facilitate approaching the competent Court of jurisdiction (*N. K. Nair and Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors. 1985 Cr.L.J. 1887, Shantanu Shivlal Mulak and Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra 2021 ALL MR Cri. 1380 and Shrikant Gopilal Rathi and Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors. Criminal Writ Petition No.581/2021*).

7. This Court is not going into the merits of the matter or entitlement of the applicant for grant of anticipatory bail in any manner. Since there is possibility of the applicant's arrest in connection with the aforesaid crime, which cannot be said to be misplaced or imaginary, in the facts and circumstances of the case, it is appropriate to protect the applicant for a limited period to enable her to approach the competent Court. Hence, the following order:

- (i) The applicant is granted protection from coercive action or arrest only for a period of three weeks from today, provided the applicant, during this period, shall not leave the State of Maharashtra, except to travel to the State of Uttar Pradesh for moving such application before the competent Court of jurisdiction;

- (ii) The applicant shall inform the concerned police station of State of Maharashtra about this order passed by the Court;
- (iii) Needless to say that the applicant shall not act in any manner that would be prejudicial to the investigation that may be carried out by the concerned police officer in respect of aforesaid FIR.

8. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)

This order is corrected vide Speaking to the Minutes order dated 29 July 2025.