

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

915 BAIL APPLICATION NO.353 OF 2023

SANTOSH SAMBHAJIRAO KADAM
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Jadhav Satej S.
APP for Respondent-State : Mr. S. P. Deshmukh.
...

CORAM : S. G. MEHARE, J.
DATE : 07.06.2023

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent-State.
2. This is a successive bail application of the applicant after rejecting his bail application on 22.07.2022.
3. The applicant is seeking bail in Crime No.6293 of 2020, registered at Tophakhana Police Station, District Ahmednagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 409, 406, 120-B read with Section 34 of the IPC and Section 3 of the M.P.I.D. Act.
4. The applicant is claiming the parity. The applicant is relied on the orders of this Court passed in the case of *Latika Nandkumar Pawar Vs. The State of Maharashtra in Bail*

Application No.1580 of 2022, dated 06.10.2022 and *Laxman Sakharam Jadhav Vs. The State of Maharashtra in Bail Application No.1109 of 2022*, dated 07.10.2022. Both these orders were passed subsequent to the rejection of the bail application of the applicant.

5. Perused the orders in the cases of *Latika and Laxman (supra)*. The Court has considered their specific role. In case of *Latika (supra)*, this Court has observed that as per the forensic audit report, she was allegedly not misappropriated any amount. As far as the role of *Laxman* is concerned, it has been observed that as per the prosecution case itself, he was not involved in misappropriation of any of the funds of the society. As far as the role of this applicant is concerned, a detail order was passed on 22.07.2022.

6. Considering the role attributed to the applicant, this Court is not satisfied that the applicant is entitled to parity. Hence, the bail application stands dismissed.

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

...

vmk/-