

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.609 OF 2023

Rahul Vilas More ...Applicant
vs.
The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Ms. Sunayana Kashid i/b. Mr. Vedchetan Patil, for the Applicant
Ms. Anamika Malhotra, APP, for the Respondent/State.
Mr. Pravin Jagtap, PSI, Pelhar police station.

CORAM : N. J. JAMADAR, J.
DATE : DECEMBER 20, 2023

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State.
2. The learned APP on instructions submits that the applicant has not complied with the undertaking given on affidavit and paid the amount to the first informant. The learned APP further submitted that the applicant has not appeared before the investigating officer and cooperated with the investigation.
3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that she has no instructions as the applicant has not responded to the calls.
4. It appears that this Court was persuaded to grant interim protection as the applicant had given an undertaking on an affidavit. What exacerbates the situation is the fact that the applicant has not appeared before the investigating officer and

cooperated with the investigation despite the interim bail having been granted on the said condition.

5. I have perused the allegations in the first information report. The applicant had allegedly defrauded the first informant by withdrawing Rs. 5,30,000/- which was obtained by way of loan in the name of the first informant.

6. Having regard to the nature of accusations and the conduct of the applicant in not cooperating with the investigation, the application deserves to be rejected.

Hence, the following order.

ORDER

The application stands rejected.

(N. J. JAMADAR, J.)