

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2271 OF 2018

Sandeep Dharma Salvi] ... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra] ... Respondent

Mr. Kuldeep Patil for Applicant.

Ms. S.S. Kaushik, APP for State/Respondent.

API A.R. Zanjurne attached to Panvel Taluka Police Station, Navi Mumbai.

CORAM :- SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.

DATE :- 06 JUNE, 2019

P. C. :-

1. The applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with C.R.No.I-33/2018 registered with Panvel Taluka Police Station, District Raigad u/sec.465, 467, 468, 471, 472, 420 of I.P.C.

2. The FIR is lodged on 20/02/2018 by Suvarna Vaitkar who was working as Gramsevak with village Palebudruk. In the FIR, it is mentioned that since December 2016 one Suresh Usatkar had constructed chawl in Survey No.84/2 in the said village. Thereafter,

he made an application for transferring the tax assessment in the name of his buyers. With the said application he submitted the original assessment plan and other documents. On verification of the said documents, it was found that Extract No.8 in respect of the property no. 233 B 29, 233 B, 233 bore forged signature of Gramsevak as well as forged seal of grampanchayat. Even signature of Sarpancha was forged. Based on these allegations the FIR was lodged.

3. Heard Mr. Kuldeep Patil, Ld. Counsel for the Applicant and Ms.S.S. Kaushik, APP for State/Respondent.

4. Mr. Kuldeep Patil, Ld. Counsel for the Applicant submitted that the applicant was not working as Gramsevak during the relevant period when the offence is supposed to have taken place. Therefore, he had no connection with the offence. He further submitted that the main accused Suresh Usatkar is making him a scapegoat and he has absolutely no connection with the offence.

5. Ld. APP on the basis of investigation papers, pointed out that during investigation the applicant's name surfaced. In the search

taken in the office of main accused Suresh Usatkar, some documents showing payments made to the applicant are also recovered. Some of the documents also bear signature of the present applicant.

6. In this view of the matter, at this stage, it cannot be said that the applicant is not involved in this case. The custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary. Therefore, there is no force in the submission of Ld. Counsel for the applicant. Hence, the following order.

ORDER

Application is rejected and stands disposed of accordingly.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)