

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2047 OF 2021**

Deepak Vishwas Deshmukh	.. Applicant
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	.. Respondent

...

Mr. Aniket U. Nikam i/b Aashish Satpute for the applicant.
Mrs.Rutuja Ambekar, APP for the State.

**CORAM: BHARATI DANGRE, J.
DATED : 2nd SEPTEMBER 2021.**

P.C:-

1 Heard Mr.Aniket Nikam, learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP Smt.Rutuja Ambekar for the State.

2 The applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail on being arraigned as an accused in C.R.No.112 of 2021 registered with Faraskhana Police Station on 28th June 2021 for allegedly committing offences punishable under Section 170, 171, 406, 420 of the IPC.

3 The complainant is one Dipak Mundada, who alleged that he was acquainted with the present applicant who introduced himself as ASI working in Mumbai. He narrate that in the year 2017, the applicant projected that he is very resourceful and has

good contacts in Mumbai, Custom Office and can arrange for appointment for his son and daughter. He collected the necessary papers and informed that for the post of Clerk, an amount of Rs.15,00,000/- would be required to spend, whereas for the post of Superintendent, an amount to be spend would be Rs.25 lakhs. In the month of December 2017, necessary forms were filled and for filling up the forms, Rs.96,000/- were handed over to the applicant and an assurance was given that the appointments would be effected forthwith if the amount is paid at the earliest. On 8th January 2018, an amount of Rs.2,00,000/- was demanded and it is alleged that he arrived in a Silver Colour Honda City with the words 'Police' inscribed on it, and at the rear seat, the Police Uniform was hanging. This convinced the complainant that the applicant was in Police Department. One lady was sitting in the car and she was introduced as Accused no.2 who was working with Customs Department. On 30th January 2018, the complainant parted with an amount of Rs.4.5 lakhs and on 8th February 2021, he parted with an amount of Rs.6 lakhs. The complainant was assured that by the end of May, joining letter would be received by his children. It is further alleged that on 10th March 2018 and 21st March 2018, he parted an amount of Rs.65,400/-, whereas on 5th May 2018, he paid Rs.14,10,000/-. The complainant alleged that in all, he paid Rs.51,17,400/- to the applicant and though the assurances were given for arranging for a job, they never fructified.

The offences therefore, came to be invoked for personation u/s.170 and for wearing a garb or carrying token used by public servants with fraudulent intention u/s.171 along with Sections 406, 420 of the IPC read with Section 34 of the IPC against the two accused persons, the applicant no.1 being arraigned as Accused no.1 whereas the woman present with him in the car arraigned as Accused no.2.

4 The accusations faced by the applicant are serious in nature as he has impersonated himself as a person from Police Department and by creating that impression, instigated the complainant to part with a huge sum of money for ensuring public employment which nowadays and difficult to secure and a person has to pass several tests and clear hurdles before being recruited.

5 In the wake of the serious allegations and looking into the nature of accusations, custodial interrogation of the applicant is very much necessary.

Application, therefore, cannot be considered and is rejected.

SMT. BHARATI DANGRE, J