

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.545 OF 2022

Ramnakar Krishnamohan Korrpati

Versus

State of Maharashtra, through P.S.O., P.S. Ramtek, Dist. Nagpur

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Shri H.B. Bargat, Advocate for the applicant.

Shri S.D. Sirpurkar, A.P.P. for the non-applicant/State.

Shri Mir Nagman Ali, Advocate for assisting to prosecution.

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR, J.

DATED : 11/08/2022

1. The applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail in Crime No.151 of 2020, dated 05.03.2020, registered with Police Station Ramtek, District: Nagpur, for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 418, 419, 420, 426, 447, 465, 457, 469 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Shri Bargat, learned counsel for the applicant submits that he has not alienated any land owned by the complainant or his daughter. Therefore, he has not committed any offence in this case.

3. He further submits that the non-agricultural order is of 2016 and thereafter, the mutation entry was recorded in 2018. Immediately thereafter, no complaint was lodged by the complainant as such there is a delay in

lodgment of the FIR. Accordingly, he submits that the custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary.

4. On the other hand, Shri Sirpurkar, learned APP strongly opposes the present application and submits that during the investigation, it is revealed that the applicant has fraudulently sold out the plots which were not owned by the applicant.

5. He further submits that the order of conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural land was obtained by the applicant by filing forged documents. Accordingly, he prays for rejection of the present application.

6. Shri Ali, learned counsel who is assisting the persecution on behalf of the complainant, submits that, the applicant has sold out number of plots either owned by the applicant and the complainant, jointly or the plots exclusively owned by the complainant. Accordingly, he submits that the applicant has received amount approximately more than 50,00,000/-. Accordingly, he prays for rejection of the present application.

7. I have perused the Case Diary and the First Information Report (FIR).

8. Considering the allegations, I am of the opinion that the offence is serious. It is pointed out that the applicant has obtained N.A. order by submitting some forged and fabricated documents. *Prima facie*, further it appears that, the applicant has sold out some plots of joint ownership of the applicant and complainant and some plots owned by the complainant. The amount involved in the alleged offence is more than Rs.50,00,000/-.

9. In that view of the matter, I am of the opinion that custodial interrogation is necessary. Accordingly, I pass the following order:

The criminal application is **rejected**.

[ANIL S. KILOR, J.]