

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,  
AURANGABAD BENCH, AT AURANGABAD.**

**Criminal Application No. 3794 of 2016**

|                      |
|----------------------|
| District : Osmanabad |
|----------------------|

1. Laxmi w/o. Datta Pawar,  
Age : 25 years,  
Occupation : Household  
and Labour,  
R/o. Shirsav,  
Taluka : Paranda,  
District : Osmanabad.
  2. Tai w/o. Sanju Pawar,  
Age : 20 years,  
Occupation : Household  
and Labour,  
R/o. Shirsav,  
Taluka : Paranda,  
District : Osmanabad.
  3. Datta Ashok Pawar,  
Age : 28 years,  
Occupation : Labour,  
R/o. Shirsav,  
Taluka : Paranda,  
District : Osmanabad.
- .. Applicants.

**versus**

1. The State of Maharashtra,  
Through the  
Superintendent of Police,  
Osmanabad.
  2. The In-charge Investigation  
Officer,  
Police Station, Kallamb,  
Taluka : Kallamb,  
District : Osmanabad.
- .. Respondents.

**With**

**Criminal Application No. 4246 of 2016**

|                      |
|----------------------|
| District : Osmanabad |
|----------------------|

Arun Rama Chavhan,  
Age : 35 years,  
Occupation : Labour,  
R/o. Shirsav,  
Taluka : Paranda,  
District : Osmanabad.

.. Applicants.

**versus**

1. The State of Maharashtra,  
Through the  
Superintendent of Police,  
Osmanabad.
2. The In-charge Investigation  
Officer,  
Police Station, Kallamb,  
Taluka : Kallamb,  
District : Osmanabad.

.. Respondents.

.....

*Mr. V.S. Undre, Advocate, for applicants.*

*Mr. S.B. Yawalkar, Addl. Public Prosecutor, for  
respondent nos.1 and 2.*

.....

**CORAM : A.M. BADAR, J.**

**DATE : 20TH AUGUST 2016**

**ORAL ORDER:**

Applicants / accused in Crime No. 35/2016,  
for offences punishable under Sections 489B, 489C,

489K and 120B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered with Police Station, Kallamb, District Osmanabad, by these applications are praying for releasing them on bail.

2. Heard the learned Counsel appearing for applicants / accused. He argued that two of the applicants in Criminal Application No. 3794/2016 are female and one of them has given birth to a child which is also in jail with the applicant. The learned Counsel further argued that applicants are falsely implicated in the crime in question.

3. The learned Addl. Public Prosecutor opposed applications by contending that the crime in question is serious and, therefore, applicants are not entitled for bail.

4. Perused the charge-sheet. Witness Juned Ekbal Shaikh is owner of a shop selling readymade clothes at Kallamb. At about 05.00 p.m. of 07.03.2016, two women and one man came to his shop and they purchased clothes costing Rs. 50/- and gave currency note of Rs. 500/- to Juned Shaikh. Juned Shaikh suspected authenticity of that currency note. Sensing suspicion of Juned Shaikh, those two ladies and one man ran away from his shop. Juned Shaikh informed Police. Squad of Police personnel went to the spot immediately and searched for suspects in the

market. That is how applicants in Criminal Application No. 3794/2016 came to be apprehended. On the spot itself, counterfeit currency notes of Rs. 500/- as well as Rs. 1,000/- came to be seized from those three applicants in Criminal Application No. 3794/2016. During their interrogation, the investigator came to know that applicant Arun Chavhan in Criminal Application No. 4246/2016 is the person who supplied counterfeit currency notes to those applicants. The investigator then apprehended applicant Arun Chavhan. On the basis of his confessional statement, 120 counterfeit currency notes of Rs. 500/- denomination and one counterfeit currency note of Rs. 1000/- denomination came to be seized. The counterfeit currency notes seized from all applicants were sent to Currency Note Press at Nashik. The expert found that those currency notes were of '*high quality counterfeit notes*'.

5. The offence alleged against applicants is having impact on the society, so also on the economy of the State. The nature of offence is important criteria for release accused on bail. Considering the nature of crime alleged against applicants, no case for grant of bail is made out.

6. Both Applications are accordingly rejected.

7. Needless to mention, that the observations

(5)

Cri. Appln. Nos. 3794 & 4246 of 2016

made in this order are prima facie in nature which shall have no bearing on trial of the case.

( A.M. BADAR )  
JUDGE

.....

puranik / CRIAPPLN3794.16etc