



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.74 OF 2024

Aarti wd/o Ravindra Sharma

Vs.

State of Maharashtra, Thru. PSO, PS Dabki Road, Akola and anr.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr. N.R. Tekade, Advocate for applicant.
Mr. H.D. Marathe, APP for non-applicant No.1/State.
Mr. Vidit A. Lohia, Advocate for non-applicant No.2.

CORAM : RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.

DATE : 10.10.2025

This is an application preferred by wife of the deceased/original complainant for cancellation of bail granted to the non-applicant No.2/respondent.

2. The First Information Report dated 28.03.2024 was lodged bearing No.166/2024 for commission of offences punishable under Section 306, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, deceased is one Ravindra Sharma. According to the First Information Report, there were business transactions between deceased and the present non-applicant No.2.

3. It is also the case of the complainant that, although the deceased was entitled to compensation and

his share of the business transaction, the same was not paid to him, and the accused/non-applicant had harassed him by not paying him.

4. In the aforesaid background, the deceased, due to harassment meted out by the accused committed suicide on 23.03.2024. On 28.03.2024, the First Information Report, as stated above, was lodged. Earlier to it, a suicide note was also seized, in which it was stated that it was the present non-applicant No.2, who was responsible for the death of Ravindra Sharma. The suicide note further states that, although the non-applicant No. 2/accused was under an obligation to repay an amount of Rs. 25,00,000, the same was not done.

5. Be that as it may, with the assistance of both the learned counsels for the parties, I have perused the record. While granting anticipatory bail to the applicant by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Akola, has taken into consideration various aspects, including the fact that there was a business transaction.

6. Prima facie, the detailed order passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Akola, in Criminal Application (ABA) No.181/2024 cannot be said to be perverse, and further while allowing the anticipatory bail application, various conditions are also imposed.

7. It is further necessary to mention here that whether perusal of the FIR would make out any case under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code or not is also one of the factors to be taken into consideration.

8. Considering the scope of present application, observations to that effect are not made. Suffice it to say that no ground is made out which requires interference with the order granting anticipatory bail. In that view of the matter, the application is dismissed.

(Rajnish R. Vyas, J.)