

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 554 OF 2019

Madhur Suresh Bhosale

...Applicant.

Vs.

State of Maharashtra

...Respondent.

Mr. Arvind Ansari I/by V.P.Bansode for Applicant.

Mr. M.G.Partil, APP for the Respondent/State.

Mr.V.G.Shinde,API from Shivajinagar Police Station present.

CORAM : P.N. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 2nd April, 2019

PC :

1. Heard learned counsel for applicant and learned APP. Perused the case diary.
2. This application is for anticipatory bail in CR No.205 of 2016 registered with Shivaji Nagar Police Station, District Pune for offence punishable under Section 420 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for applicant specifically submitted that

applicant is nowhere concerned with the present crime as at the material time he was working with Paramount Realities Marketing Company as Marketing Manager for Kalyani Constructions and in his capacity as Marketing Manager was required to show sample row houses to the customers and is nowhere concerned with any financial transaction and has thus, contended that applicant is falsely involved in the crime. Perusal of record would reveal that while working in the said company applicant along with absconding accused Ajay Bhutte and Sachin Jagtap initially accepted Rs.50,000/- from complainant and thereafter during the period from 21.2.2012 to 6.12.2012 further accepted total amount of Rs.1,80,000/- and in spite of assuring possession of row house by 2014 had failed to comply with the same.

3. Report further revealed that, along with complainant 45 other investors had visited applicant who had also seen row houses and out of them applicant, her sister Vaishali had also deposited amount is also not given possession of said row house. Learned APP submits that during the course of investigation there are seven other investors

whose statements are recorded during the course of investigation and the total amount involved in this crime is to the extent of Rs.13,35,000/-.

3. From the case diary, it is also found that applicant on accepting amount from complainant had issued money receipts duly signed by him which falsifies the case of applicant of his working as marketing Manager required to show sample flat to the customers. In this view of the matter, for further investigation, custodial interrogation of applicant is necessary. Application is liable to be rejected and accordingly rejected.

(P.N. DESHMUKH, J.)