

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 3338 OF 2017

Ranjana w/o Balasaheb Jagdale,
Age 50 years, Occ. Service, R/o. ... **Applicant**
C-44, N-11, L Sector, HUDCO
Corner, Yadvanagar, Aurangabad,
Tq. & Dist. Aurangabad.

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra, ... **Respondent**
Through : Police Station City
Chowk, Aurangabad.

Mr.S.S. Naik, Advocate for the applicant
Mr. S. B. Joshi, APP for the State.

CORAM : K. L. WADANE, J.

DATE : 17th JULY, 2017

ORDER:

1. Heard Mr. Naik, learned advocate appearing for the applicant and Mr. Joshi, learned A.P.P. appearing for the respondent-State.

2. This is an application under the provisions of section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with Crime No. 237/2017 registered with

City Chowk Police Station, Aurangabad, for the offences punishable under section 420, 406, 468, 471 read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. One Sachin Panchkar r/o. Railgaon Tq. Phulambri lodged a complaint against the present applicant and her husband alleging that, he is resident of Dolsni Tq.Sangamner, and since last two years he is residing with his family at Aurangabad in rented premises in the house of Savita Bhande and serving in Multi Service and Xerox, HUDCO, Aurangabad. At that time he acquainted with his neighbour i.e. present applicant. At that time present applicant and her husband told his mother-in-law that she is working as Senior Clerk in University in degree department and in University there is requirement of peons and due to her relations and by paying Rs.10 lakhs, she will gave appointment to the relatives. On the say of his mother-in-law and on assurance of giving appointment order, he along with his mother-in-law, wife and Jagdish Jogdand, went to the house of Ranjana Jagdale i.e. present applicant in the year 2015. At

that time her husband was also present there. After discussion they told that his father and brother have sold ancestral land and he had Rs. 5 lakhs. Subsequently on 10.06.2015 the informant brought money from his village and went to the house of applicant and paid an amount of Rs. 5 lakh.

4. There sum and substance allegations against the present applicant that, she had collected an amount of Rs. 10 Lakh for the purpose of giving appointment in the university. Subsequently certain orders were issued but those are found to be fake.

5. Learned advocate for the applicant submits that, there is rivalry between the informant and the applicant, due to which the first information report was lodged. Learned APP submits that, the list of the selected candidates appear on the letter head of the University which is found to be fake, so also, some appointment orders were also found to be fake.

6. I have gone through the statement of witnesses Ashwini Pachkar, Jagdish Jogdand, Manisha

Vaidya. On perusal of the same it appears that, same was the modus-operandi of the applicant to collect huge amount from various persons by saying that she will provide employment in the university.

7. Looking to the nature of the allegations, I am of the opinion that, the custodial interrogation of the present applicant is necessary. Prima-facie it appears that, the applicant had collected huge amount from various persons that too by creating false and fabricated documents on the letter head of the university. In view of the above, applicant is not entitled for bail. Hence, application is rejected.

(K. L. WADANE, J.)

mkd/-