IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3086 OF 2025

Mary T. Francis ...Applicant
V/s.
The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent.

....

Mr. Priyal Gopaldas Sarda for the Applicant.
Mr. B.V. Holambe Patil, APP for the Respondent/State.
PI Shyam Paware, IO Meghwadi Police Station and PSI Ghadage, Pairavi Officer are present.

....

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 12.11.2025.

P.C. :

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail.

2. The applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No. 509 of 2024 registered at Meghawadi Police Station, Mumbai for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

3. According to the prosecution, in the month of March 2018, the first informant saw an advertisement with regards to an Indian Railway Catering and Tourism Corporation (IRCTC) tender and as such he contacted the applicant. It is alleged that from March 2018 to December 2021, the first informant paid an amount of Rs.51,40,264/- to the present applicant. The said payments were made on the assurance of the applicant that she would submit a tender to the IRCTC in partnership with the first informant for

obtaining a Food Stall at a Railway Station. It is further alleged that, in order to induce the first informant to part with the said amount, the applicant had provided forged and fabricated documents purporting to show that she had applied for the said tender and as such she also provided forged receipts of payment to IRCTC towards the same. However, it is alleged that no such tender was ever floated by the IRCTC and that the applicant had thereby deceived and defrauded the first informant to the tune of Rs.51,40,264/-.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent / State.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant, without prejudice to her rights and contentions, is willing and ready to repay the entire amount to the first informant. It is submitted that there is no need of custodial interrogation and the applicant is willing to cooperate in the investigation. It is further submitted that there are no other criminal antecedents against the applicant.

6. On the other hand, learned APP for the respondent/State submits that this is not a case of mere cheating. It is submitted that the applicant has gained confidence of the first informant and induced him to part with the said amount under the pretext of submitting a tender to IRCTC for a Food Stall. It is submitted that the applicant forged the documents bearing the seal and name of

IRCTC to create a false impression that a genuine tender process was submitted and that certain payments had been made to IRCTC. It is submitted that considering the nature of crime, the applicant may not be released on anticipatory bail.

7. I have perused the first information report. It refers to a receipt dated 8th October 2020, which was sent by the present applicant to the first informant. Upon verification, the first informant found the said receipt to be forged. During the course of investigation, the first informant produced several documents before the Investigating Officer, which were sent by the applicant to him. The Investigating Officer got these documents verified from IRCTC, and all of them are found to be forged. Considering the nature of forgery, I am not inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail. Hence, the Application is rejected.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]