



ITEM NO.8

COURT NO.11

SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 12740/2024

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 05-07-2024 in CRBA No. 2519/2022 passed by the High Court Of Judicature At Bombay)

RANJANA TANAJI WANVE

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Respondent(s)

(IA No.210520/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.210522/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No.210516/2024-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 22-10-2024 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.T. RAVIKUMAR  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KAROL

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Anand Dilip Landge, AOR  
Mr. Arjun Waghmare, Adv.  
Mrs. Sangeeta S Pahune Patil, Adv.  
Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Rahul Prakash Pathak, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR  
Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.  
Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

The petitioner seeks leave to challenge the order dated 5.7.2024 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Criminal Bail Application No. 2519 of 2022.

Crime No. 922 of 2020 was registered at P.S. Hadapsar, District Pune, Maharashtra against the petitioner under Sections 364A, 384, 386, 388, 323, 506(2), 143 and 120B read with Section 34

I.P.C. and under Sections 3(1)(ii), 3(2) and 3(4) of Maharashtra Control of Organized Crimes Act (MCOCA). In connection with the said crime, the petitioner was arrested on 4.3.2021. As a matter of fact, she was named as an accused only in the supplementary charge sheet filed on 15.7.2021.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State of Maharashtra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the supplementary charges sheet was filed on 15.7.2021, the charges were not framed by the Court so far. It is the further submission of the counsel for the petitioner that going by the list of witnesses cited by the prosecution, 101 witnesses are to be examined. Since the charges are yet to be framed by the Court, there cannot be any certainty when the trial would be completed.

In the said circumstances, it is submitted that the petitioner may be released on bail. Per contra, learned counsel for the State would submit that the antecedents of the petitioner would suggest that with the same modus operandi, the petitioner has been involved in other offences as well. In such circumstances, though the petitioner was arrested on 4.3.2021, releasing the petitioner on bail would be against the interest of the society.

It is true that the petitioner is allegedly involved in a serious offence. However, the indisputable fact is that in connection with the Crime, the petitioner was arrested on 4.3.2021 and the charge sheet was filed on 15.7.2021. The Court is yet to frame the charge. That apart, more than 100 witnesses are to be examined.

Taking note of all the above circumstances, we are of the considered view that the petitioner cannot be detained further as an under-trial prisoner. In such circumstances, we are inclined to order for the release of the petitioner on bail, if not required in any other case, subject to the terms and conditions to be imposed by the Trial Court. In that regard, the petitioner shall be produced before the Trial Court forthwith. Needless to say that in case the petitioner is found involved in other or similar offence, it would be open for the prosecution to approach for cancellation of bail.

The special leave petition is disposed of as above.

Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(DR. NAVEEN RAWAL)  
DY. REGISTRAR

(MATHEW ABRAHAM)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)