



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 608/2025

Anjum w/o. Zuber Sheikh Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. N. B. Rathod, Advocate for the Applicant.
Mr. V. A. Thakare, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 15/09/2025.

. Heard.

2. The applicant has apprehension of arrest in connection with Crime No.620/2025 registered at Police Station Pandharkavda, District Yavatmal for the offences punishable under Section 420 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. It is alleged that the applicant and her husband duped the first informant by giving assurance of job in Railway as Commercial Inspector. They took an amount of Rs.20,00,000/- and gave the fake appointment order. Since 14.07.2020, the first informant is duped.

4. The learned Counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant is a lady. She is doing job in Ashram School as a Superintendent. She is having small daughter. The allegations are not made against this applicant. Main allegations are against her husband. The alleged role played by this applicant is that she was present with her husband when the money was taken. The learned Counsel for the applicant has further stated that the applicant and her husband have lodged the complaint against the other persons, who duped her and her husband by giving assurance to give job to many persons.

Considering the role of this applicant, the offence is not made out against this applicant and the applicant is ready to cooperate the police. She has not received any notice though it is alleged that the notice was issued which is not communicated to the applicant and, therefore, she has not attended the Police Station. She is ready to cooperate the police and hence, prayed to protect her by granting anticipatory bail.

5. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that the applicant was served the notice at her work place. The presence of applicant is there when the amount was transferred. Considering the role of this applicant, the custodial interrogation of this applicant is necessary. The accused No.1 is absconding. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard both the learned Counsel for the parties.

7. The allegations made against this applicant are that she along with her husband duped the neighbour by Rs.20,00,000/-, giving assurance that they will give the job of Commercial Inspector in Railway. Though she tried to return the amount, the cheque was dishonoured. Considering the transaction between the first informant and the applicant and as the appointment order was issued against the daughter of the first informant, this is not a fit case to release the applicant on bail. Though the notice was issued, the applicant has not cooperated. Hence, the application is rejected.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)