

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1573 of 2025

Rekha Dadasaheb Patil and Ors. ... Applicants

versus

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

with

Interim Application No. 2134 of 2025

in

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1573 of 2025

Patan Agriculture Produce Market

Committee Patan ... Intervenor

In the matter between

Rekha Dadasaheb Patil and Ors. ... Applicants

versus

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

Mr Sanjeev Kadam, Senior Advocate a/w Mr Prashant Raul a/w
Ms Aditi Rajput, Mr Harsh Khot, Mr Suraj Mhadgut i/b Ms
Varsha M Thorat, for the Applicant.

Mr Pankaj Deokar, APP, for Respondent / State.

Mr Ganesh Bhujbal a/w Mr B D Shinde, for the Intervenor.

PC 1474, Amol M Pise, Malharpetha Police Station, Satara
City, is present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 24 June 2025

P.C.:

Interim Application No. 2134 of 2025

- . Heard.
2. For the reasons stated in the intervention application and no objection from the other side, the same is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).
3. The interim application stands disposed of accordingly.

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1573 of 2025

- . Heard.
2. The applicant to implead the intervenor as a party respondent to this application. Necessary amendment shall be carried out within one week from today.
3. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submits that the applicants held the position of directors of the Agriculture Produce Market Committee (APMC), Patan, only upto 22 April 2022. Thereafter, the administration of the management of the APMC were assumed by Government appointed Administrators. The impugned FIR relates to alleged financial irregularities covering the entire fiscal year commencing on 1 April 2022 and concluding on 31 March 2023. The Ld. Counsel further submits that, the applicants were in the office for a brief period of merely 21 days during the said financial year. During this short tenure, no board meetings were conveyed, nor were any substantive or policy

related decisions taken by the applicants in their capacity as directors. The applicants had neither the opportunity nor the authority to exercise any meaning control over the financial or administrative affairs of the APMC during the relevant period to which the allegations pertain. Hence, according to the ld. Counsel, the applicants' implication in the FIR is misplaced and without substantive basis. He further submits that the administration and management of the day-to-day affairs were solely remained with the Secretary and the designated staff. The applicants, at no point in time, were involved in or associated with the routine functioning or financial administration. There is no material on record to indicate, even *prima facie*, that the applicants participated in or had knowledge of any financial transaction which is now alleged to have resulted in misappropriation of funds or constituted a criminal breach of trust.

4. Furthermore, the learned Counsel submits that the FIR does not attribute any specific role or any culpable act to any of the applicants. The contents of the FIR, as well as the findings emerging from the audit reports and the complaint, predominantly implicate the Secretary and the operational staff of the APMC, who were directly entrusted with the day-to-day functioning and dealings of the APMC. According to the

learned Counsel, the applicants have been unnecessarily arrayed as accused persons in the present proceedings without any legally sustainable basis.

5. The Ld. Counsel for the intervenor seeks liberty to file additional documents.

6. By consent stand over to 11 July 2025.

7. In the meanwhile, there shall not be any coercive action against the applicants in the present crime till the next date.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)