

VRJ

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.989 OF 2022

Raju Vasant Shewale

... Applicant

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1434 OF 2022

IN

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.989 OF 2022

Ranjit Shahajirao Todmal

... Applicant

In the matter between

Raju Vasant Shewale

... Applicant

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

... Respondents

Mr. Kuldeep Patil i/by Mr. Prashant S. Hagare for the
applicant in ABA.

Mr. Advait U. Shukla for the applicant in IA.

Mr. Amit A. Palkar, APP for the respondent/State.

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.

DATED : JULY 25, 2023

PC.:

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with FIR bearing C.R. No.202 of 2022 registered with Indapur Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 403, 408, 409, 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and under Sections 5 and 6 of Prize, Chits and Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, 1987 and

under Sections 21, 22, 23 and 25 of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019, the applicant is seeking relief under Section 438 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973.

2. According to prosecution from 2014 to 2019 accused persons started a chit fund wherein they were collecting money from depositors on monthly or half monthly basis. The accused persons purchased various properties with the money of depositors and misappropriated it for own use. Accordingly, offence was registered against the applicant and other accused.

3. The applicant filed application under Section 438 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 before the learned Sessions Judge which has been rejected by order dated 23 March 2023. Aggrieved thereby, the applicant has filed present anticipatory bail application.

4. Learned advocate for the applicant submitted that some of the co-accused have been released on anticipatory bail by this Court. There is no material to indicate that the applicant had misappropriated amounts of depositors and purchased properties from that amount. He is ready to cooperate with the investigation. Charge-sheet is filed. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary.

5. Per contra, learned APP submitted that there are specific allegations against the applicant. On the date of report, the misappropriated amount was to the tune of Rs.6,54,18,000/-; however it has now increased to Rs.14,37,78,090/-, which is likely to increase further. The present applicant has accepted from the

complainant and misappropriated amount to the extent of Rs.86,00,000/-. Therefore, custodial interrogation is necessary to understand the *modus operandi* and to recover misappropriated amount.

6. I have gone through the documents on record and charge-sheet. The material in the form of statement of witnesses indicate that the applicant took money from around twelve persons. Prima facie, the material on record including original registers indicate that the applicant had accepted amount from innocent investors promising high returns, however, refusing to pay back the amount. It prima facie appears that the acts of applicant are in violation of Sections 3 and 5 of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019. The purpose of introduction of the said Act was to prevent such unregulated deposit schemes at their inception, thereby making accepting of such deposits pursuant to unregulated deposit schemes is punishable offence. The material on record indicates that the applicant accepted the deposits pursuant to unregulated scheme and committed fraudulent default.

7. In so far as the orders of release passed by coordinate Benches of this Court is concerned, said orders indicate that the applicants therein repaid the received amount or settled the dispute with the investors.

8. In the facts of the case, the amount of misappropriation by the applicant which is to the tune of Rs.86,00,000/- is yet to be recovered. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled to claim parity with other co-accused.

9. The allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. Prima facie, it appears that considering nature of promise made by the applicant he was aware of the fact that he may not be able to return the amount at such high returns. Therefore, at this stage essential ingredients of alleged offence are made out.

10. The anticipatory bail application, therefore, stands rejected. No costs.

11. In view of disposal of the anticipatory bail application, interim application does not survive and the same stands disposed of accordingly.

12. Considering the fact that there is ad-interim relief granted during the pendency of the anticipatory bail application, same shall continue for a period of two weeks from today.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)