

ISM

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 421 OF 2015**

Arun Govindrao ChormungeApplicant

V/s.

1. The State of MaharashtraRespondents
2. Chetan Manohar Padiyar

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 419 OF 2015**

Arun Govindrao ChormungeApplicant

V/s.

1. The State of Maharashtra
2. Vishada Vijay PatilRespondents
3. Sou. Girija Swapnil Naik @ Girija
Gajanan Danke

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 420 OF 2015**

Arun Govindrao ChormungeApplicant

V/s.

1. The State of MaharashtraRespondents
2. Sujata Sunil Shelgikar

Mr. Shriram Chaudhari advocate for the applicant
Ms. S. S. Kaushik APP for the State

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE : JANUARY 11, 2019.

P.C.

Present applications are by complainant pursuant to the provisions of Section 438 (2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking cancellation of bail against the respondent in respect of Crime No. 133 of 2015 registered with Sadar Bazar Police Station for offence punishable under sections 420, 406, 465, 468 and 477(A) of the Indian Penal Code.

2 Present applicant-original complainant claims to be working as a Consultant with the Fitness Firm. According to the complainant, in an audit misappropriation of substantial amount was noticed, as such accused were called upon by the employer-company to explain the said defalcation/mismanagement of company funds of which respondents were holder in trust.

3 The said issue was formed to be basis for registration of offence against respondent-accused persons. In Criminal Misc. Application

No. 410 of 2015, the learned Sessions Judge, Kolhapur granted protection in favour of respondent-accused on 18/05/2015.

4 Application is moved by the complainant seeking cancellation of bail on merits.

5 The fact remains that accused persons are charge-sheeted and granted regular bail by the Court below. The contention that the protection ought not to have been granted if appreciated on merit, what is noticed is there are no convincing reasons which warrants interference in the order of grant of bail. The view expressed by the learned Sessions Judge cannot be termed to be as a shocking one or which ought not to have been taken in the facts and circumstances of the case. The accused have co-operated in the investigation after their release and are already charge-sheeted.

6 In that view of the matter, applications lack merit, stand rejected.

[NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.]