

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1106 OF 2019

Ravindar Yashvant Mehendale] ... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra] ... Respondent

Mr. Vikram V. Tare Patil for Applicant.
Smt. A.A. Takalkar, APP for State.
PSI S.B. Nikalje attached to Roha Police Station, Dist. Raigad.

CORAM :- SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.
DATE :- 03 JUNE, 2019

P. C. :-

1. The applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with C.R.No.190/2017 registered with Roha Police Station, District Raigad u/sec. 420, 466, 467, 468, 471 r/w 34 of I.P.C.

2. The FIR is lodged by one Harshad Modi. According to him, he had purchased open plot of land Gut No.390 from one Smt.Nayan Dighe situated in village Shedsai, Taluka Roha in 2015. The first informant had primary talks with the present applicant who was

acting as an estate agent. However, there was no further progress. In the year 2017, first informant wanted to sell his land and therefore he tried to collect the documents related to the said land. At that time, he came to know that on 15/10/2015 itself the said land was purportedly sold to the present applicant. For the said purpose Power of Attorney issued in favour of Meena Joshi was used to execute the sale deed. For the said purpose third person was used to impersonate the first informant. The first informant's forged identification documents were used for the said purpose. On the basis of these allegations the FIR was lodged.

3. Heard Mr. Vikram V. Tare Patil, Ld. Counsel for Applicant and Smt. A.A. Takalkar, Ld. APP for State.

4. Ld. APP submitted that the allegations in the FIR were substantiated by the investigation carried out by the police. By using forged identity and creating forged documents the transaction was entered into for the said purpose. The applicant even involved his mother-in-law. Considering the serious nature of the offence and forgery of documents, the applicant does not deserve to be released on

anticipatory bail. His custodial interrogation to find details of forgery and impersonation is necessary. Hence, the following order.

ORDER

Application is rejected and stands disposed of accordingly.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)