2026:BHC-AUG:13699

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 188 OF 2026

Swamini @ Mitali @ Mugdha D/o
Hemant Kulkarni,
Age : 29 Years, Occu. : Nil,
R/o Room No. 304, Sumangal,
A-2, 3rd Floor, Near Fadke
Ground, Kalyan (West),
Dist. Thane. .. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

Shri Ujwal S. Patil, Advocate for the Applicant.
Mrs. P. V. Diggikar, A.P.P. for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.
DATE : 26TH MARCH, 2026.

FINAL ORDER :

. Heard both sides. Applicant is seeking enlargement on bail in respect of offence bearing Cr. No. 477/2023 registered with Chalisgaon City Police Station, Chalisgaon, Tq. Chalisgaon, Dist. Jalgaon for the offences punishable U/Sec. 420, 406, 464, 466, 468, 471 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Applicant is arrested on 03.07.2024.

3. It is reported by the informant to the police on 29.04.2014 that he was having matrimonial dispute against his wife and

they were separated since 2013. The matrimonial disputes were pending at various forums. He was introduced with the applicant through her sister's friend. It was reported to him that she was a lawyer having practice in High Court and also representing C.B.I. He was being assured to conduct his cases and manage everything. Accordingly, he blindly relied upon the applicant and parted money from him from time to time. Under various pretexts right from managing the Presiding Officer of the Court concerned, money was extracted by applicant.

4. It is further alleged for procuring false grounds and bogus orders of the Court were shown. He was being given false threats to extract the amounts. He was also shown bogus warrants to spare amount. Thus, from time to time an amount of Rs. 72,64,200/- was extracted from the informant. It was revealed that applicant was being defrauded by her.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that it was never represented that she was a lawyer and informant himself paid the amount. It is submitted that the payment made online was refunded and the remaining allegations of extracting the amount are false and concocted. It is submitted that the investigation is over and no clinching material is against her. The witnesses are stated to be interested. It is further contended that co-accused Hemant was also released on bail.

6. Learned A. P. P. has repelled the submissions of the

applicant pointing out that the total fraud is of Rs. 72,64,200/-, out of that only marginal figure is refunded. It is submitted that applicant is habitual offender and nine offences are registered against her which are serious economic offences involving fraud of huge amounts. The written instructions issued by the investigating officer addressed to the Public Prosecutor vide letter dated 10.02.2026 is placed on record. It is submitted that applicant was absconding from 29.04.2024 till her arrest. A supplementary charge sheet was required to be filed on 29.08.2024.

7. First information report categorically refers *modus operendi* of the applicant. She has not only indulged in deceiving the informant, but stated to have procured the amount to manage the Judicial Officers. At times she did not hesitate to extend the threats as well as lure the informant by false promises. A forged warrant was also prepared by her after obtaining the amount. Part of it Rs. 11,58,200/- is transferred to her blood relatives.

8. My attention is adverted to the transcription of the call record between the applicant and the informant which is quite incriminating. C.D.R. report is available to corroborate the prosecution story. The incriminating material is collected in the investigation to show that informant parted the amount to the applicant. It further reveals that even the registration of the applicant with the Bar Council is bogus. It is pertinent to note

that still the entire amount has not been recovered from the applicant. The bank statements collected during the investigation are incriminating. Applicant is involved in serious economic offence and she is habitual offender.

9. I find no substance in the application and the submissions of the learned counsel for the applicant. The bail application is rejected.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME J.]

bsb/March 26