

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

3 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 4923 OF 2016

**SUBHASH S/O BABURAO PAWAR
& ANR.**

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

.....

Mr. S.S.Gangakhedkar, Advocate for Applicants.

Mr. S.B.Yawalkar, A.P.P. for Resp. – State.

.....

CORAM : A.M.BADAR, J.

DATE : 28th SEPTEMBER, 2016

.....

PER COURT :

1. Applicants, who are accused in Crime No. 460/2016 registered at Shivaji Nagar police station, Beed, Dist. Beed for the offences punishable u/ss 420,406,471,468,182,107,193,196,198 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, by this application are seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. Heard learned counsel for applicants. He strenuously urged that main accused are already behind bar and all documents are already seized from main accused. He further argued that applicants stood as surety to co-accused as

one of the co-accused is related to applicant No. 2. Therefore, in submission of learned counsel for applicants, custodial interrogation of present applicants is not warranted.

3. Learned A.P.P. opposed the application by contending that crime in question is serious and same is affecting administration of justice.

4. Perused F.I.R. and record made available. Co-accused, upon their arrest, have stated fake names and applied for bail. After passing necessary order by concerned Court, present applicants stood as surety to co-accused for enabling them to be released from custody. *Prima facie*, it appears that co-accused had produced false and fabricated documents by stating their false name and applicants stood as surety to them. The act attributable to applicants is affecting administration of justice and, therefore, this is not a fit case to release applicants on anticipatory bail. Hence, the following order.

(i) Criminal Application stands rejected and disposed of.

[A.M.BADAR, J.]