

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.328/2016

Pradeep S/o Vasantryao Gadge

..Vs..

State of Maharashtra through Police Station Officer, Sitabuldi Police Station,
Nagpur

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri S.P. Sonwane, Adv. for the applicant.
Shri V.R. Thakre, A.P.P. for the respondent / State.

CORAM : Z.A.HAQ, J.

DATE : 14.6.2017.

Heard.

The applicant, apprehending arrest in crime registered against him for the offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 465, 468, 471, 473 and 476 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, has sought pre-arrest bail. The accusations against the applicant are that he has given letter in the capacity of President of Maharashtra Pradesh Patrakar Mahasangh addressed to the Founder and Chairman of the Bhartiya Vidya Bhavans, Nagpur requesting that admission be given to the child whose name is referred in the letter and alongwith letter the applicant has given a forged letter under the signature of Chairman of Central Board of Secondary Education recommending admission for the same student.

The applicant is granted interim protection by this Court by order dated 7th June, 2016 imposing conditions and one of it being that the applicant shall attend the police station everyday and co-operate with the investigation. The Advocate for the applicant has submitted that the applicant has co-operated with the investigating agency and has attended the police station on as many as 20 occasions. It is undisputed that none of the student for whom the recommendation letters were given is granted admission in the school. The applicant claims to be a Journalist which fact is not controverted by the non-applicant. The applicant has stated that he is not involved in any other crime / offence. The non-applicant has not been able to show that custodial interrogation of the applicant is required for further investigation.

Considering the above facts, in my view, the interim protection granted by this Court by the order dated 7th June, 2016 is required to be confirmed. The interim order is confirmed and the application is **allowed** accordingly.

JUDGE