

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1391 OF 2019

Rahul Vateshwar Dhage Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra Respondent

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 988 OF 2019
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1391 OF 2019**

Mr. Vishal Arun Dani Applicant/Intervenor

In the matter between

Rahul Vateshwar Dhage Applicant/Accused

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra Respondent

None for Applicant.

Mr. A.R. Patil, APP for State.

Mr. Anilkumar K. Patil a/w Ms. Sonal Rajput for Intervenor/Applicant in Criminal Application.

Coram : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

Date : 3RD AUGUST 2021

P.C.:

1. Learned Counsel appearing for the applicant is repeatedly remaining absent. This Court has given enough opportunities.

2. The applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with Crime No.177 of 2019, registered with Sarkarwada Police Station, Nashik for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 406 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegations are, the applicant alongwith co-accused has pawned duplicate gold in the Bank so as to avail loan of Rs.1,54,64,000/-.

4. I am informed that the Valuer is also acted in connivance with the accused person i.e. the applicant, as a consequence, he is also impleaded as accused. Though the applicant is on interim protection from this Court, in view of submissions made on last occasion, vide order dated 9th August, 2019, a statement was accepted that the applicant shall deposit real gold and repay the loan amount, which he has failed to comply. Since the conditions of ad-interim bail ordered by this Court is not complied with, the learned APP assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, Mr. Anil Kumar Patil was justified in claiming the rejection of the application.

5. Perusal of F.I.R. reflects that in a calculated manner, the applicant alongwith co-accused is indulged into a serious economic offence, which has adversely affected the position of the co-operative financial institutions, who were holding deposits of common people in trust.

6. Satisfaction of the necessary ingredients from the contents of the F.I.R. could be inferred and the claim of the learned APP that custodial interrogation of the applicant is very much justified. In that view of the matter, Anticipatory Bail Application stands rejected.

7. As a consequence, pending application also stands disposed of.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)