

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

CRIMINAL ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 515 OF 2020

Vinaykumar Radhamohan Singh

...Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

.....

Mr. Paras Yadav, Advocate for the Applicant.

Smt. Veera Shinde, APP for the Respondent – State.

Mr. B.P. Dube, (P.S.I.) Chakan Police Station, Pune, Present.

.....

CORAM : PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.

DATE : 2nd MARCH, 2020

PC :

1. The applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in C.R. No. 69 of 2020 registered with Chakan Police Station, Dist. Pune, for offences punishable under Sections 406, 407, 511, 465, 467, 468, 471, 473 r/w Section 34 of Indian Penal Code.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant is working as an office assistant with Sangam Petroleum. Premkumar Sing took 9510 Kg. Furnes Oil from the company for transporting it to Pokharkar Engineering. The accused had conspired and prepared the bogus chalan receipt and by using the said chalan gave 3000 Kg. Furnes Oil worth Rs. 84,000/- to R.S. Metal Work and while proceeding to the company, the police accosted the accused.

3. Applicant preferred an application for anticipatory bail before the Sessions Court which was rejected by order dated 24th February, 2020.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant is not concerned with the alleged transaction. He is not beneficiary. He was not found at that time when the truck was intercepted. Chalan was recovered from the co-accused. Custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary.

5. Learned APP submitted that the applicant has played vital role in this crime. He was acting in connivance with the co-accused. The applicant is in the same business. During interrogation of the arrested accused, involvement of the applicant has been disclosed. There is sufficient evidence against the applicant. His custodial interrogation is necessary.

6. I have perused the FIR and the investigation papers. On perusal of the said documents, it is apparent that the applicant's involvement has been disclosed. The applicant had allegedly ran away from the truck while it was intercepted. The interrogation of the accused and other material on record shows the complicity of the applicant. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

7. Hence, I pass the following order :

ORDER

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 515 of 2020
stands rejected and disposed of accordingly.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)