



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION(ABA) NO. 880 OF 2025

Namrata Suraj Madgulwar Vs. State of Maharashtra

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

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr.R.G.Waghmare, counsel for the applicant.
Mr.V.A.Thakare, APP for the State.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 11/12/2025

1. The applicant has apprehension of arrest in Police Station Crime No.1306/2025 registered at Awdhutwadi, District Yavatmal for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3 and 4 of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999.

2. The First Information Report has been registered against TWJ Trend with Jazz Company which accepted deposits. The allegations are made that there is misappropriation of Rs. Eighty Three Crores. The amount was taken from the depositors and the assurance was given that the handsome interest would be paid to them. Initially, the

interest was given, but thereafter the depositors came to know that they are duped. There are 16 branches all over Maharashtra. The husband of the applicant is the Branch Manager at Yavatmal Bank and the applicant is the wife of the said person and she is accountant in said branch.

3. The learned Counsel has stated that there is no specific allegation against this applicant. The applicant has delivered a baby two months back. As there is no role played by this applicant and when the trial Court has protected, she has attended the Police Station for eight times. She is ready to co-operate with the police. Considering her difficulty that she is having a small child, prayed to protect the applicant by granting ad interim anticipatory bail.

4. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that the applicant is accountant and the fraud is of Rs. Eighty Three Crores. The Trial Court has rejected the application considering the allegations made against all of them. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

5. The applicant is the accountant in branch at Yavatmal. On perusal of the First Information Report it appears that there are no specific allegations against this applicant. The husband of the applicant, who is the Manager of the said branch is already arrested. He is in custody. The

applicant has attended the concerned Police Station whenever called.

06. The learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant has attended the police station for eight times as the condition was imposed to attend the police station whenever called. The police called but did not put any question. The custody of this applicant is not required. Hence, prayed to confirm the interim protection granted on 27.11.2025.

07. The learned APP opposed the application stating that there is fraud of huge amount. Thirty five persons are duped. The role of this applicant is there. Only because she is having small child, the case cannot be considered. Hence, prayed to rejected the application.

08. Heard both the sides and perused the record.

09. The applicant is the accountant in the branch of Yavatmal. The allegations are against her husband. Considering the role played by her and as she is available for investigation, and she has attended the police station for eight times. Though the police called her, no investigation was conducted. Considering the allegations made against her and as the custody of this applicant is not required for the

investigation, the order passed on 27.11.2025 granting ad interim protection is confirmed on same terms and conditions. Hence the following order:-

- i] The application is allowed.
- ii] The order dated 27/11/2025 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail is confirmed.
- iii] The applicant shall attend the police station as and when called by the Investigating Officer.
- iv] The application stands **disposed of**.

JUDGE