

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2022 OF 2024

Parwinder Singh Fingh @ Prithvi Singh

Fingh

... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

Mr. Kuldeep S. Patil a/w Mr. Ranjeet H. Patil and Ramsing Rajput
i/by Agrud Partners for the Applicant.

Ms. Rutuja A. Ambekar, APP for Respondent-State.

**CORAM: MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : 30th SEPTEMBER 2024**

P.C. :

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

2. On 16th August 2024, this Court granted interim order in favour of the applicant. Following observations were made, while granting the interim order :

“6. The tenor of the grievance raised by the informant in the FIR pertains to alleged inducement given by the applicant. But, the statement of the informant itself demonstrates that the applicant had allegedly referred to a business that would help in earning substantial gain. The informant himself referred to the agreement, copy of which is placed at Exhibit ‘A’ with the present application.

7. Considering the material on record, this Court is of the opinion that prima facie it could be said that the informant

was perhaps aware of the kind of business that he was getting into, while agreeing to invest the amounts as shown in the statement of the informant. The applicant has specifically relied upon the module of direct selling business to claim that the informant, like many others, had agreed to become an independent representative or direct selling agent, who would earn commissions on the basis of the extent of business that he or she was able to develop. Considering the documents that are proposed to be filed as additional documents, indicating atleast certain payments made to the informant, this Court is inclined to grant interim relief in favour of the applicant, while granting time to the learned APP to take detailed instructions in the matter.”

3. Although, the learned APP does not have clear instructions, the learned counsel for the applicant, on instructions, submits that the applicant has indeed remained present before the Investigating Officer as directed by this Court and he has been cooperating with the investigation.

4. Considering the aforesaid situation, this Court is of the opinion that no purpose would be served by placing the applicant behind bars, as this Court in the above quoted portion of the interim order did find that a *prima facie* case is in favour of the applicant.

5. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the interim order dated 16th August 2024 is confirmed and the application is allowed.

6. The applicant is directed to remain present as and when called by the Investigating Officer, till filing of the charge-sheet. He shall continue to cooperate with the investigation. He shall not

influence the informant, witnesses or any person concerned with the case and he shall not tamper with the evidence.

7. The application is disposed of.

MANISH PITALE, J.