IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1350 OF 2019

Ranjeet R Londhe ...Applicant

Vs.

State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Manoj M. Gadkari, for the Applicant.
Mr. S. H. Yadav, for the State.

CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.

DATE : JUNE 25, 2019

P.C.:

1. The applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with C.R. No.330/2019 registered with Yerwada Police Station, Pune under Section 420, 406, 465, 467, 471, 323, 504, 506 r/w. 120-B of the IPC.

2. The FIR is lodged by one Sanjay Khomne on 4/5/2019. He has mentioned in the FIR that he was in need of money for his business. He got in contact with the main accused Nitin Rashinkar through present applicant. When the first informant went to office of Nitin Rashinkar, at that time present applicant and Umesh Kokane were present. That time Rashinkar had given him loan of Rs.4,50,000/- which the first informant duly repaid. Thus, there was cordial relations

between the first informant and Rashinkar. It is mentioned in the FIR that present applicant, Rohan Londhe and one Umesh Kokane were associates of Rashinkar. In September 2017, Rashinkar told the informant that he was in need of Rs.1.5 Crores. At that time, Rashinkar's wife told him that Rashinkar was financially sound and the informant would earn good profit. Even Rashinkar's father-in-law supported her. In October 2017, present applicant, Rohan and Umesh also represented to him that Rashinkar was a big businessman and he could help the first informant. Rashinkar himself told him that if first informant invested Rs.1.5 Crores, he could give him returns to the tune of more than Rs.3.5 Crores. Rashinkar and his associates told him that he could obtain loan to the tune of Rs.1.5 Crores. Initial amount was given by Rashinkar which was used for processing the loan. For said processing Rashinkar, present applicant, Rohan and Umesh had gone to the loan advancing company together. The informant was granted loan by Jumbo Finwest India Limited to the tune of Rs.1.5 Crores on 23/11/2017. The amount of Rs.1,46,46,000/- was deposited in his bank account. On the same day, Rs.10 Lakhs was withdrawn in cash and was taken by Rashinkar. It is alleged in the FIR that Rohan Londhe, present applicant and Umesh took blank cheques from him. On 27/11/2017, Rashinkar and the present applicant took the informant to Janta Sahakari Bank and on their say informant transferred Rs.1 Crore in the account of Rashinkar and transferred Rs.20 Lakhs in the account of Rohan Londhe. Thereafter, the informant was continuously asking for his money but his money was not given back instead he was abused and threatened by all of them. Thereafter, Rashinkar entered some fraudulent land transaction with the first informant. Even thereafter, money was not returned and therefore he lodged the FIR.

3. Heard Shri. Gadkari, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri. Yadav, Ld. APP for the State.

4. Shri. Gadkari pointed out that co-accused Umesh is granted bail by this Court on 20/6/2019. He submitted that there is not much difference between his case and the case of present applicant. He further submitted that in any case even otherwise in the FIR there are hardly any allegations against the present applicant. The FIR did not mention that applicant himself had taken money from the first informant. As against this, Ld. APP pointed out that co-accused Kokane is granted bail but he had not received money from the first informant. Even during the investigation nothing indicated that Umesh Kokane had

received money from Rashinkar. On the other hand, investigation revealed that Rashinkar had transferred Rs.10,10,000/- from his account in the account of present applicant. Thus, there is direct financial connection between Rashinkar and the present applicant. At this stage, there is reason to believe that present applicant is instrumental in inducing the first informant to seek loan and then transfer the money in the account of Rashinkar. The FIR mentions that when the amount of Rs.1 Crore was transferred in the account of Rashinkar at that time Rohan Londhe and present applicant were present with the informant. Taking all these factors into account custodial interrogation of the applicant appears to be necessary though one co-accused is already granted bail. In this view of the matter, the application is rejected.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)