

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3151 OF 2025

Firdos W/o Mohammed Waseel Sayyed ...Applicant

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Aslam Malik, Advocate for the Applicant.

Ms. Anagha Deshmukh, APP for the Respondent/State.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 19.11.2025.

P.C. :

1. This is an application for Anticipatory Bail.
2. The applicant is apprehending her arrest in Crime No. 1187 of 2025 registered at Ghatkopar Police Station, for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. It is the case of the prosecution that in the month of February-2025, the applicant was introduced to the first informant by her friend. The applicant lured the first informant and witnesses to invest in her business of garments and assured profitable returns thereon. Accordingly, the first informant and other

witnesses invested an amount of Rs.74,88,000/- in the business of the applicant. It is alleged that the applicant, however, failed to return the said amount to the first informant and the other witnesses as assured.

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

5. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that with ulterior motive false allegations are made against the applicant. It is submitted that there is no iota of material to show that the amount of Rs.74,88,000/- was paid to the present applicant. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is no need of custodial interrogation and that the applicant is ready and willing to co-operate in the investigation. The learned counsel for the applicant in the alternative submits that the dispute, if any, between the parties is of a civil in nature.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP for the respondent-State has drawn my attention to the statement of various witnesses. It is submitted that the custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary to recover the amount in question.

7. I have perused the FIR and the statements of the witnesses. In absence of any motive for them to implicate the applicant in a false case, at this stage, I am not inclined to disbelieve their statement. There are about nine victims to who the present applicant has defrauded. Considering the nature of crime, I am not inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail. The application is rejected.

8. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that interim protection granted by the Sessions Court was extended till today. It is submitted that the same may be extended for a period of two weeks to enable the present applicant to approach the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The learned APP submits that considering the nature of crime, the interim protection may not be extended.

9. Considering the fact that the interim protection was granted on 31.10.2025 and the same was extended till today, the same shall remain in force for a period of two weeks.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]