

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY:
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR
Criminal Application [ABA] No. 15 of 2015
[Sunil Kashinath Meshram Vs. State of Mah.]

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. Rajnish Vyas, Adv., for the Applicant.
Mr. Ahirkar, APP for respondent.

- - - -

CORAM : A.B. CHAUDHARI, J.

DATE : 17th June, 2015.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Perused the diary produced by the learned APP.
Following is the reply filed by the respondent. I quote
para 4 thereof as under:-

"4. It is submitted that, the Investigating Officer obtained original documents from the lawyer of Alok, i.e., Adv. Lalit Jain as well as obtained documents from the complainant and bogus sale deed prepared by Mahendra in his own name and showing Leela as a Kiran. It is submitted that the present applicant/accused Sunil and Mahendra both are working together and Leela Meshram is very well known to Sunil Meshram. Both played vital role in preparing forged and fabricated documents. The Investigating Officer also taken statement of Leela Meshram. From the said statements and

from the documents collected by the Investigating Officer, it is clear that the present applicant/accused in connivance with the Mahendra Mhaskar has committed the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 471` r/w Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. It is further submitted that both these accused persons are habitual offender and against the present applicant/accused 16 crimes are pending at Police Stations Ajni, Ambazari, Sadar, Panchpaoli, Wadi and Jaripatka.”

I have seen the statement of Leela Meshram recorded by the police. I have seen the document, namely sale-deed and the connected documents collected by the Investigating Officer during the course of investigation.

Looking to the statement of Leela Meshram and and looking to the further fact that the applicant-accused is a habitual offender in such type of crimes, I think the applicant is not entitled to the grant of relief of anticipatory bail. Hence the following order:-

Criminal Application No. 15 of 2015 is rejected.

Interim order made by this Court granting anticipatory bail is cancelled.

Learned counsel for the applicant prayed for withdrawal of this application.

Since hearing has been completed, request cannot be granted. Prayer is rejected.

Judge

|hedau|