

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 634 OF 2018

Mr. Sampat Rampal Singh ... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

Mr. Vikas K. Singh a/w Ravi Dwivedi for Applicant.
Mr. Deepak Thakre, APP for State.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.
DATE : JUNE 25, 2018.

P.C. :

. This is a second application moved by the Applicant seeking pre-arrest bail in Crime No. 462 of 2015, wherein the other co-accused are already chargesheeted for an offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 469, 471 read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 66, 66 (C) and 66(D) of the Information and Technology Act.

2. The learned Counsel for Applicant – Accused would urge that the Applicant – Accused is very much available for the investigation without prejudice to his right to contest the prosecution case on merits. He

submits that he is ready and willing to deposit the amount of Rs. 6,49,650/- with the investigation agency, if he is given sufficient time for the same which would reflect his *bona fides*. He would then urge that if the protection is granted, he shall appear before the Investigation Officer and shall co-operate in the investigation. The last submission is that the Applicant is falsely implicated in the crime in question.

3. Mr. Thakre, the learned APP would oppose the claim and submits that since the year 2015 Applicant – Accused is absconding and not co-operating in the investigation. According to him, offences are also registered against the Applicant at other places. He submits that since the offence in question involve financial implications, the Court should not be liberal in granting protection. According to him, after the first application was rejected, there are no subsequent developments which warrants interference in an consecutive Applicant for grant of pre-arrest bail.

4. Considered rival submissions.

5. The record depicts that investigation in the crime for the role attributed to the other accused is already completed. During the search of

the premises of the Applicant, certain incriminating material came to be seized. So as to avoid the investigating agency, the Applicant appears to have left his premises without any intimation to the landlord, as reflected from the statement of the landlord.

6. The mode and manner of commission of the crime depicts that there are more accused involved in the crime in question. The investigation carried out till date speaks of the prima facie involvement of the Applicant in crime, as he appears to have acted in aid of the other accused persons for making forged credit cards, activating the same and withdrawing the amount. The offence has financial implication over the working of the financial institutions.

7. In the aforesaid background, no case for grant of pre-arrest bail is made. The Application fails. Hence, the same is rejected.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)