

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

CRI. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 383 OF 2022

Purushottam Bapurao Kurumkar	..Applicant
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent

Mr. Shailesh S. Kharat, for the Applicant.
Mr. A. R. Kapadnis, APP for the Respondent / State.

MAMTA
AMAR
KALE

Digitally signed
by MAMTA
AMAR KALE
Date:
2022.02.16
10:23:28 +0530

**CORAM : C.V. BHADANG, J.
DATE : 15 FEBRUARY 2022**

P.C.

. The Applicant, apprehending arrest, in connection with investigation of Crime No.643/2021 of Police Station Lonikand, Pune City, under Section 420, 467 and 468 of IPC, is seeking anticipatory bail.

2. The aforesaid crime is registered on the basis of the complaint lodged by Anil Rajaram Sanas on 17 December 2021. The first informant is running a Security Agency and was assigned with the work of guarding a plot at Village Wagholi belonging to one Aparna Varma who is a resident of Dubai. According to the first informant,

on 19 November 2021 at 9.50 hours, co-accused Dada Satav and 10 to 12 others came on the plot which includes the Applicant and claimed that there is a authority letter in respect of the said plot, purportedly executed by Aparna Varma in favour of one Vishwanath Tatyaba Kamble which was a notarised document. The Applicant happens to be a witness on the said authority letter which is claimed to be forged and fabricated. The first informant called the personal assistant of Aparna Varma and verified whether she has executed any such authority letter, when the first informant was told that there is no such authority letter executed by Aparna Varma.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties. Perused record.

4. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the Applicant that the Applicant has no role in the matter and he has signed as a witness on the authority letter on the say of Dada Satav. Thus, it can *prima facie* be seen that the Applicant is not disputing that he has signed as a witness on the authority letter. A specific query was made to the learned counsel for the Applicant that whether Applicant knows Mr. Kamble or Ms. Aparna Varma, to which the answer is in the negative. Thus, *prima facie* it appears that the Applicant without knowing and identifying the parties to the authority letter, has signed the authority letter as a witness.

5. Learned APP has pointed out the statements of the witnesses recorded during the course of investigation including the statement of Mr. Rajendra Sode which *prima facie* shows that the Applicant was instrumental in getting the said document executed. Thus, at least *prima facie* it cannot be accepted that the Applicant had merely signed on the say of Dada Satav. It is necessary to note that the offences of the present nature relating to property documents are on a rise. The matter requires investigation, for which custodial interrogation of the Applicant is necessary. The Criminal Application is accordingly rejected.

C.V. BHADANG, J.