IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRI-INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3742 OF 2023
IN
CR. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLN. NO. 2341 OF 2023

Indubai Anna Patil .....Intervenor
IN THE MATTER BETWEEN
Arun Shankar Patil and Anr. .....Applicants
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra .....Respondent

Mr. Dhananjay Rananaware a/w Mr. Samarth Chavan and Mr. Shubham Dhoble, for the Intervenor.

Mr. Sharad T. Bhosale, for Applicants.

Mr. C. D. Mali, A,P.P, for the Respondent-State.

PSI, Mr. S. D. Bhilari, Karad Taluka Police Station, present.

SHANTANU SHANKARSA DHUDUM
Digitally signed by SHANTANU SHANKARSA DHUDUM
Date: 2026.10.01 18:53:29 +0530

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATE : 1st OCTOBER, 2026.

P.C.

1. Heard Mr. Dhananjay Rananaware, learned Advocate for the Intervenor, Mr. Sharad T. Bhosale, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Mr. C. D. Mali, learned A.P.P. for the Respondent–State.

2. By the present Interim Application, the Intervenor (Complainant), who is 88 years of age, seeks permission to intervene in Anticipatory Bail Application No. 2341 of 2023.

3. Mr. Sharad T. Bhosale, learned Advocate for the Applicants in the Anticipatory Bail Application, strongly opposes the present Intervention Application on the ground that the subject matter is civil in nature and, therefore, the Intervenor has no locus whatsoever to intervene or participate in the present proceedings.

4. Mr. C. D. Mali, learned A.P.P. for the Respondent–State, submits that he has no objection to the Intervenor being permitted to intervene in the Anticipatory Bail Application. He further submits that the presence of the Intervenor would assist the Court in the adjudication of the matter.

5. Perusal of the F.I.R. indicates that the Intervenor, who was 85 years of age at the time of filing of the F.I.R., had lodged a complaint with the police alleging that she had been cheated by none other than her own brother and nephew.

6. It is astonishing that the Applicants have opposed the present Intervention Application filed by the Intervenor, particularly in the light of the allegations made in the F.I.R.

7. Be that as it may, the Intervenor, being the original Complainant and presently 88 years of age, is a proper and necessary party to the Anticipatory Bail Application. Though the Intervenor has sought permission to intervene in the proceedings, having regard to the facts and

circumstances of the case, permission is granted to the Intervenor to join the proceedings as Respondent No. 2.

8. The Applicants are directed to implead the Intervenor as Respondent No. 2 in Anticipatory Bail Application No. 2341 of 2023.

9. Mr. Sharad T. Bhosale, learned Advocate for the Applicants, is directed to carry out the necessary amendment in the cause title of Anticipatory Bail Application No. 2341 of 2023 to implead the Intervenor as Respondent No. 2. The amendment shall be carried out forthwith.

10. In view of the above, the Interim Application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (b) and stands disposed of accordingly.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)