IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 164 OF 2025

Suvarna Basawraj Charaki,
Age : 40 Years, Occu. : House wife,
Add: Thakkar Colony,
Mangalawar Peth, Satara,
Tq. & Dist. Satara. .. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Prasad Panchal, Advocate for the Applicant.
Shri Nitin B. Patil, A.P.P. for the Respondent No. 1.
Shri Shubham Gagan, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.
Shri S. H. Mohite, Head Constable B. No. 421, Shahupuri Police Station, Satara.

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.
DATE : 29TH OCTOBER, 2026.

FINAL ORDER :

. Heard.

2. Applicant is seeking pre-arrest protection in furtherance of Cr. No. 431/2024, registered with Shahupuri Police Station, District Satara, for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The protection was given to the applicant vide order dated 21.04.2025 on certain conditions. It is informed by the learned A.

P. P. that the investigating officer has no objection for the compliance of the order passed on 21.04.2025. The charge sheet has been filed in the matter. After the interim order, no endeavour has been made by the investigating officer or the respondents to secure further presence of the applicant so as to facilitate further investigation before filing of the charge sheet.

4. This matter was heard on 12.10.2026. It is recorded by Coordinate Bench that the learned counsel for the applicant on instructions of his client volunteered to deposit Rs. 12,00,000/- before the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Satara. Accordingly, amount was directed to be deposited on or before 19.10.2026. No compliance was made. The matter was listed on 21.10.2026, but it could not reach and it was adjourned.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that he was appearing through V. C. on 12.10.2026 and there was communication gap. He did not make any submission of depositing Rs. 12,00,000/-. The statement was wrongly recorded and there was some misunderstanding. Learned counsel for the applicant has addressed the matter on merits. He has made it clear that his client is not ready to deposit Rs. 12,00,000/-.

6. The self same counsel who is present before this Court was appearing on 12.10.2026 through V.C. If there was misunderstanding or technical defect in communicating the submissions, the applicant or the learned counsel could have

promptly filed some application or affidavit clarifying the position. The order passed on 12.10.2026 was promptly uploaded. There was ample opportunity to them to clarify the position and point out to the Court which was available in entire week commencing from 12.10.2026. Now it cannot be countenanced that it was wrongly recorded that the applicant was ready to deposit an amount of Rs. 12,00,000/-.

7. This type of practice is deprecated. The conduct of the applicant is dishonest and after thought. The minutes of today's order shall be brought to the notice of the Trial Court, which can be dealt with during the course of trial. There is no reason to infer that any wrong statement was recorded by the Coordinate Bench in the order dated 12.10.2026.

8. I have already recorded that the investigating officer did not require the presence of the applicant for the purpose of investigation before filing of the charge sheet. I have no alternative than to allow the present application. I, therefore, pass following order.

O R D E R

A. The anticipatory bail application is allowed.

B. Ad-interim relief granted on 21.04.2025 shall stand confirmed.

C. The applicant shall cooperate in expeditious disposal of the trial and shall also cooperate further investigation if so required.

D. Anticipatory bail application stands disposed of.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME J.]

bsb/Oct. 26