

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1338 OF 2017

Yashpal Lilaram Grover ... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

.....
Mr. Madhav J. Jamdar for the Applicant.
Mr. S.R. Agarkar, APP for the State.
.....

CORAM : T. V. NALAWADE, J.

DATE : 16th AUGUST, 2017

P. C. :

1. The present Application is filed for anticipatory bail in C.R.No.I-77 of 2014 registered with Khadaki Police Station, Dist. Pune for offences punishable under sections 467, 468, 471, 477A and 420 of the Indian Penal Code.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Papers of investigation were made available.

4. Present applicant was working as Assistant Manager in Indian Bank, Khadki Branch, Pune. There are allegations against him that he has created some false loan accounts and made transfers of amounts from one account to another account and using that *modus operandi*, misappropriated an amount of Rs. 9 lakh. Some amounts were credited in the account of his own son.

5. The crime was registered on the basis of complaint made by the Chief Manager of Indian Bank, in which he has given particulars of the aforesaid things done by the present applicant. In twelve cases, such false record was created by him.

6. The learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that when show cause notice was issued to him, he had given explanation to police. The contentions made in the so-called say given to the police show that he has virtually admitted the aforesaid irregularities. He is trying to blame the superior officers also, but that will be the matter for investigation and it is open to the police to find out as to whether any employee of the bank has helped him. The fact remains that behind the back of account holders, the aforesaid things were done by the present applicant. There are

statements of persons like Santosh Yadav, some amount was given to him, but the fact remains that false record was created. There are account extracts in respect of other account holders which are consistent with the aforesaid allegations. There are statements of other bank employees also. In such cases custodial interrogation is a must. This Court holds that no relief can be granted in favour of the present Applicant as claimed.

7. In the result, the application stands rejected. Ad-interim relief granted earlier, stands vacated.

(T. V. NALAWADE, J.)