

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2368 OF 2024**

Shahin Salim Sayyed @ Shahin Samir Patel ... Applicant
vs.
The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

Mr. Pravin Khandare a/w. Mr. Suraj V. Gadkari for applicant.

Mr. Mayur S. Sonavane, APP for respondent-State.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : 09th SEPTEMBER, 2024**

P.C. :

. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent-State.

2. This anticipatory bail application pertains to FIR dated 24.09.2020 i.e. an FIR registered as far back as almost 4 years ago. The applicant had filed an anticipatory bail application in the year 2020 itself, which was rejected on 15.12.2020. It appears that subsequently, in the year 2024, the applicant again filed an application for anticipatory bail before the Sessions Court, wherein the Sessions Court, while rejecting the said application, observed as follows:

“5. I considered the rival submissions carefully. It may be noted that the victim of the offence is financial institution. The applicant alleged to have fabricated the documents of 12 women and obtained loan in the name of those women. It is further alleged that the said loan amount is misappropriated by the applicant. Therefore, it will necessary to investigate who else aided the applicant, where those documents were fabricated and the manner of

fabrication of the documents. For these reasons, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary. It cannot be said that there is change in circumstance only because the applicant deposited the amount. It is also to be noted that the first bail application was rejected on 15.12.2020. It is not explained where the applicant was since then and why she has not submitted herself to the law agency. It appears that she avoided the investigation. For all these reasons, I hold that the applicant is not entitled to anticipatory bail. Her application deserves to be rejected. Accordingly, I pass following order :-

:ORDER:

1. Cri. B. A. No. 547/2024 is rejected.
2. Copy of this order shall be furnished to the applicant free of costs.
3. Nothing expressed in this order shall be construed as expression of opinion of the Court on the merits of the case.
4. Cri. Bail Application is disposed of accordingly.”

3. There is substance in the observation made by the Sessions Court quoted hereinabove. Even otherwise, this Court has perused the present FIR, which levels serious allegations as regards cheating and forgery. Offence under Section 467 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, is also registered, which provides for maximum imprisonment for life. *Prima facie*, the ingredients in respect of the said offences are made out on the basis of the statement of the informant, who is a responsible officer of Ujjivan Small Finance Bank, Sangli. No case is made out for granting anticipatory bail.

4. The application is rejected.

(MANISH PITALE, J)