



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION(ABA) NO.727 OF 2025
Nita Shubham Patil Vs. State of Maharashtra 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.S.A.Chaudhari, counsel for the applicant.
Mr.Vinod Thakare, APP for the State.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.
DATE : 12/11/2025

1. The applicant is apprehending the arrest in connection with Crime No.295 of 2025 for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(2) read with Section 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Section 66 of the Information Technology Act and Section 3 of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors (In Financial Establishments) Act, 1999.

2. The allegations made against this applicant are that the applicant along with other co-accused had duped the persons by introducing the scheme of dollar Pay Club Network Marketing. The husband of the applicant and his friend Prashant Prabhakar Raut has introduced the said scheme by luring the people that money will be returned by three times. Many persons have deposited the amount. The

applicant has stated while granting ad-interim protection that only because she is wife of Shubam Patil, who is the person who has introduced the said network marketing. FIR is registered against her. She is having small child and therefore, the interim protection was granted with a condition to attend the police station and co-operate the machinery.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant is attending the police station as per the conditions imposed, but the learned APP has stated that the applicant is not cooperating. The husband of the applicant is absconding. She is giving evasive answers. Even she has not given the phone number and has denied that she was operating that phone. The statement of the witnesses shows her involvement. It is not the case that, only some of the amount was transferred in her account and she has blamed her husband but from the statements of witnesses her involvement is shown. As per the statement of one of the witness, she has given advertisement on Face Book. Considering her involvement and as she is not cooperating, during her interim protection, the application stands rejected.

JUDGE