



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR**

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 569 OF 2024**

Suresh Ukanrao Salodkar and another. Vs State of Maharashtra.

---

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of  
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders  
or directions and Registrar's order

---

Court's or Judge's Order

---

Mr. M.V. Rai, counsel for applicants.

Mr. A. J. Gohokar, APP for non-applicant/State.

**CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.**  
**DATED : 22/08/2024.**

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police, in connection with Crime No. 550/2024 registered with Police Station Ramnagar Wardha, for the offence punishable under Section 420, 406, 467, 468, 471 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, the applicants approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The original complainant is the wife of applicant No. 1, and applicant No. 2 is admittedly residing with applicant No. 1. It is alleged that there was no matrimonial relationship between applicants No. 1 and 2, however, applicants No. 1 and 2 are living together. The original complainant – Vanita Sureshrao Salokar, lodged the complaint under Section 156(3) of the Cr.PC., alleging that, after marriage, she was not treated well by applicant No. 1, and therefore, she withdrawn herself from the company of applicant No. 1 and started residing separately. It is further alleged that, after she started residing separately, the present applicants, by preparing her forged Aadhar Card and Pan

Card shown to her residents as Rewatkar Layout, purchased the plot, and said plot was sold. On the basis of said complaint, the order was passed by the Magistrate, and the FIR was registered.

3. It is submitted by Mr. M.V. Rai that applicant nos. 1 and 2 are residing together in a relationship. The applicant No. 2 has two daughters from an earlier marriage. He submitted that applicant no. 1 is the owner of the said plot, and as far as the fabrication of the documents is concerned, it is a false allegation against them. As far as the custodial interrogation is concerned, which is not required as the documents are already in the possession of the investigation agency, in view of that, the applicants be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application on the ground that the forged and fabricated documents were prepared by the applicants in the name of the informant and the same were used by them. In view of that, the custodial interrogation of the present applicant is required.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State, undisputedly the informant was the wife of the applicant no. 1, but subsequently they got separated, and thereafter, the informant started residing separately. As far as the allegations are concerned, admittedly, the said documents are in the possession of the

investigating agency, therefore, custodial interrogation of the present applicants is not required. Undisputedly, the record shows that the applicants and the informant were separated long back in 2000 itself. Thus, considering the entire aspect of the matter that the informant was not residing along with applicant No. 1 and the alleged documents are already in the possession of the investigating agency, the custodial interrogation of the present applicants is required. In view of that, they have made out a case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order:

- a] The application is **allowed**.
- b] In the event of arrest, in connection with Crime No. 550/2024 registered with Police Station Ramnagar Wardha, for the offence punishable under Section 420, 406, 467, 468, 471 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, the applicants **(1) Suresh Ukanrao Salodkar (2) Vanita @ Niranjana Suresh Salodkar** shall be released on bail, on executing a P.R.Bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one solvent surety, in the like amount.
- c] The applicants shall attend the concerned police station once in a week on Sunday between 10.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. and shall cooperate with the investigating agency.

- d) The applicants shall not induce, threat or promise any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the present case.
6. The criminal application is **disposed of**.

[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]