

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 285 OF 2014
(For cancellation of Anticipatory Bail)**

The State of Maharashtra

...Applicant

Versus

Kiran Bapurao Kachare

...Respondent

Mr. S. H. Yadav, A.P.P for the Applicant-State

None for the Respondent

CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.
FRIDAY, 9th JUNE, 2017

P.C.

1. Heard learned A.P.P for the State.
2. By this application preferred under Section 439(8) of the Cr.P.C, the applicant-State seeks cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent-accused, by the learned Ad-hoc District Judge and Additional Sessions Judge, Baramati, vide order dated 11th April, 2014 passed in Criminal Bail Application No. 195 of 2014.

3. Learned A.P.P states that the respondent-accused has been charged for the offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code. According to the prosecution, the respondent along with other co-accused prepared forged and bogus Sale Deed and had also impersonated one Nandkumar Abu Baravkar. Learned A.P.P states that hence, the custody of the respondent is necessary to verify the forged document and hence, seeks cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent-accused.

4. The learned A.P.P has not brought on record anything to show that the respondent-accused has violated the conditions imposed on him whilst granting anticipatory bail vide order dated 11th April, 2017. It also appears that this Court (Coram : Mrs. Mridula Bhatkar, J.) vide order dated 9th March, 2017 passed in Criminal Application No. 286 of 2014, was pleased to reject the application preferred by the State seeking cancellation of bail granted to co-accused Sadhu Baburao Shinde. It is not in dispute that the documents are in the custody of the police.

5. Considering the aforesaid, no ground is made out for cancelling the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent-accused. Accordingly, the application is rejected.

REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.