



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.286 OF 2025

(Shilpa Vasantrya Udayure and ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. S.V. Sirpurkar, Advocate a/w Mr. A.R. Fule, Advocate for the
applicant.
Mr. C.A. Lokhande, APP for the State.

CORAM:- URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED :- AUGUST 05, 2025.

Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.60/2025 registered with Police Station Durgapur, District Chandrapur for the offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 468 and 471 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, the applicants approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The crime is registered on the basis of report lodged by the informant Saurabh Doliram Bhute on an allegation that while he and his friend - Palash Dahiwade were in search of job, they came in contact with one Rakesh Atram. The said Rakesh Atram informed that his friend Prakash Atram is doing the job of providing employment. The said Prakash Atram then informed that he is acquainted with Lawrence Henry who will provide Government job to them and on the promise of providing

the government job the amount of Rs.15,00,000/- for securing the job was obtained from them. On the basis of the said report police have registered the crime against the present applicants.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicants submitted that applicant No.1 is the wife of co-accused, applicant No.2 is the father-in-law and applicant No.3 is the father of the other co-accused Henry. As far as their role is concerned no role is attributed to them. They are implicated merely because they are the close relatives of the co-accused Lawrence. Their custodial interrogation is also not required, and therefore, they be protected by granting ad-interim protection.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the application and invited my attention towards the investigation papers and submitted that the statements of the witnesses not only said that the amount was demanded by applicant Nos.1 and 2 but the active role is attributed to them and the statements also shows that some communication was also communicated to them by forging the same. The amount is also received by the co-accused Lawrence Henry in his bank account. When they were called at the Mantralaya the applicant Nos.1 and 2 also present there and applicant No.2 has shown them the identity card which allegedly issued by the Health department of Mantralaya which was forged one. Thus, he submitted that considering the role attributed to the present

applicant which is the active role, their custodial interrogation is required. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. On hearing both the sides and on perusal of the investigation papers as far as applicant No.3 is concerned there is substance in the contention of the learned Counsel for the applicant that he is implicated merely because he is the father of the co-accused Lawrence Henry. As far as applicant Nos.1 and 2 are concerned against whom the specific allegations are levelled by the informant as well as the other witnesses. The specific role is attributed to them, therefore, the custodial interrogation of applicant Nos.1 and 2 is required. In view of that, at this stage, no case is made out as far as applicant Nos.1 and 2 are concerned but the application of applicant No.3 deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order:

(i) The application is partly allowed.

(ii) The prayer of applicant Nos.1 and 2 for grant of anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

(iii) In the event of the arrest, the applicant No.3 – John Stalin Henry in connection with Crime No.60/2025 registered with Police Station Durgapur, District Chandrapur for the offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 468 and 471 read with Section 34 of the

Indian Penal Code, be released on anticipatory bail, on executing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one solvent surety in the like amount.

(iv) The applicant No.3 shall attend the concerned police station once in a week i.e. on every Monday between 10.00 AM to 1.00 PM. and shall cooperate with the investigating agency.

(v) The applicant No.3 shall not induce, threat or promise any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the case either personally or by way of electronic media.

(vi) The amount deposited by applicant Nos.1 and 2 be refunded back to applicant No.3.

6. The contravention of any of the condition would lead to the cancellation of bail.

7. The application stands disposed of.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)