

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.87 OF 2025**

Sawon Chaudhary	...Applicant
Versus	
The State Of Maharashtra	...Respondent
WITH	
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.193 OF 2025	
Shantanu Sandeep Mhatre	...Applicant
Versus	
State Of Maharashtra	...Respondent

Karma Vivan a/w. Avsan Allana i/b. JSA, Advocate for the Applicant.

Ms. Rutuja A. Ambekar, APP for the State.

Adv. Sachin B. Chandan a/w. Sumitkumar Nimbalkar a/w. Govind M. Mundhe, for intervenor.

Rajendra Ghevadekar, API Panvel Police Station, Navi Mumbai present.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATED : 11 MARCH 2025

P.C.:

1. This matter is moved without for reliefs, preferring any application. The matter has been placed before this Court since the matter was mentioned yesterday morning seeking an urgent hearing. This Court is arraigned with matter pertaining to Anticipatory Bail Applications. The ground on which the counsel appearing for the applicant had sought an urgent hearing was that he wants to deposit amount in Court and there is some confusion with the regard to

calculation. The order passed on 15 January 2025 granted protection to the present applicant. In the second paragraph of the said order it was recorded that the applicant without prejudice to his rights is willing to deposit the said amount of Rs.63,45,000/-. Provided sum time is granted to deposit. It was further recorded that the applicant will deposit the amount of Rs.30,00,000/- before the MPID Court at Panvel within a period of four weeks.

2. Today, it has been submitted before me that a sum of Rs.30,00,000/- has been deposited. As regards the balance amount of Rs.33,45,000/-, the counsel for the applicant submits that a Demand Draft of Rs.26,45,000/- is ready and the said amount will be deposited by tomorrow before the MPID Court, Panvel. It is further submitted on behalf of the applicant that they are seeking a concession of Rs.7,00,000/-, as they believe the amount has been wrongly calculated. The learned APP and the Informant's counsel have opposed the submissions

3. I have heard the learned counsel for both sides. Granting any kind of concession to the applicant would amount to a modification of the order passed by the coordinate bench of this Court. The applicant has taken precious judicial time of this Court, by arguing a baseless and meritless submissions. Hence, the request made by the applicant is rejected, and the applicant is directed to pay a cost of Rs.50,000/- to the

Kiritkar Law Library within one week from today.

4. Stand over to 20 March 2025.

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)