

Digitally signed
by Dnyaneshwar
Ashok
Date: 2024.08.23
11:14:46 +0530

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 508 OF 2024

Jeetendra Kumar Raj ...Applicant
Versus
The State Of Maharashtra ...Respondent

**WITH
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 509 OF 2024**

Anurag Kumar Patanwar ...Applicant
Versus
State Of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Paras Yadav i/by Sumant Patale for the Applicant.

Mrs. Mahalakshmi Ganapathy, APP for Respondent-State.

CORAM : N. J. JAMADAR, J.
DATE : 20th AUGUST 2024

PC.:

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the Applicants and the learned APP for the State.
2. By an order dated 10th July 2024, this Court had directed the Applicants to appear before the Investigating Officer on 18th and 19th July 2024 between 01:00 pm to 05:00 pm.
3. The Investigating Officer, on instructions, submits that the Applicants did not appear before the Investigating Officer.
4. It is imperative to note that, on 22nd April 2024 also a grievance was made before the Court that in terms of the interim

order, the Applicants did not appear before the Investigating Officer and, thereupon, the Applicants were directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 15th, 16th and 17th May 2024.

5. The learned Counsel for the Applicants submitted that the order has been communicated to the Applicants. However, as the Applicants are the residents of Chhattisgarh, they could not appear before the Investigating Officer.

6. The material on record indicates that amounts were credited to the accounts of the Applicants. Interim order was passed on the condition that the Applicants shall appear before the Investigating Officer and co-operate with the investigation. There is a positive breach of the order passed by this Court on 10th July 2024 to appear before the Investigating Officer. There is no reasonable cause for not appearing before the Investigating Officer. As the Applicants have not appeared before the Investigating Officer and co-operated with the Investigation, they do not deserve the discretionary relief of pre-arrest bail. Thus, the Court is constrained to dismiss the Applications for pre-arrest bail.

ORDER

- (i) Applications for pre-arrest bail stand dismissed.
- (ii) Interim order stands vacated.

(N. J. JAMADAR, J.)