

Digitally signed  
by SATISH  
RAMCHANDRA  
SANGAR  
Date:  
2022.09.13  
11:03:04  
+0530

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**  
**BAIL APPLICATION NO. 4058 OF 2021**

Abdul Sattar Kasim Ali Shaikh

... Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

Mr.Rahil A. Siddiqui a/w Huma A. Shaikh h/f Mr.S.V.Vishwakarma  
for Applicant.

Ms.Anamika Malhotra – APP for State.

**CORAM : BHARATI DANGRE, J.**  
**DATE : 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2022**

**P.C. :-**

1. The Applicant is an accused of committing an offence punishable under Sections 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471 and 474 of the Indian Penal Code. The said offence is registered with RCF Police Station, Mumbai on 11/2/2021. On completion of investigation, the charge-sheet has been filed and the Applicant came to be arrested on 11/02/2021.

2. With the able assistance of the Counsel for the Applicant and learned APP, I have perused the charge-sheet placed on record.

3. An information was received from a secret sources that a person known as Abdul Sattar is indulging in an activity of providing diploma certificates from Maharashtra State Board of Technical Education for a sum of Rs.2000/- to Rs.15000/-. Accordingly, a trap was laid and a witness was prepared to offer said sum to the Applicant. The proceedings are recorded in the form of Panchanama, which form part of the charge-sheet. On the raid being conducted, the Applicant was found in possession of various such certificates / mark lists. The printer, computer as well as the material for preparing the forged diploma certificates came to be seized. The various certificates found to be forged and the happenings of the event are recorded in minute details through the said Panchanama.

4. It is apparent that the Applicant is involved in a serious offence of being found in possession of document knowing, it to be forged and intending it to be used and therefore, Section 474 has been invoked, which on being established would invite, an imprisonment for life or imprisonment for either description which may extend to seven years.

Though learned Counsel would submit that the

document which are found in his possession would not attract Section 467 as it is not a valuable security. At this stage, looking to the serious nature of accusations, Applicant do not deserve his release on bail.

5. The Application is, therefore, rejected.

**(BHARATI DANGRE, J.)**