



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

55 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 363 OF 2025

FIROZ KADAR SHAIKH ALIAS PINJARI

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...

Advocate for Applicant :

Mr. B. R. Warma h/f. Mr. Jain Mohan C.

APP for Respondent/State: Mr. G. O. Wattamwar

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 24.03.2025

P.C. :

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

2] The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.126/2022, registered at Dhule City Police Station, District Dhule, for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471, 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3] This court by order dated 12.03.2025 granted interim protection to the applicant noting submissions of the applicant and reasons at paragraphs no.3, 4 and 5, as under:

“3] The case against the applicant is that the applicant, who was working as Circle Officer, has not verified the documents of the co-accused in respect of declaration of project affected person and has accordingly granted certificate of project affected person in favour of the co-accused, on the basis of which, the co-accused was able to secure a government job. It is further stated that the original project affected person, as such, deprived from getting benefit on account of certificate being granted to the co-accused. It is further stated that the applicant was required to verify the application made by the co-accused and to submit a report in that regard. However, the applicant has not verified the documents and has participated in granting certificate of project affected person to the co-accused. It is further stated that during the course of investigation, the applicant has denied his signature on the verification register but the same is done by the applicant.

4] The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the certificate is issued in the year 1997 and the same is issued based upon the appropriate affidavits filed by the applicant on an application being made. He further submits that the alleged incident happened approximately 28 years back and since no documents were shown for reference, the applicant found it difficult to recall specific details. He further submits that during investigation the police has recorded his statement.

5] Considering the submissions made, as the case pertains to the year 1997 and the case is based on documentary evidence, so also, at the highest the applicant has failed to discharge his duties, so also, the applicant is not a beneficiary of the certificate, the applicant is granted interim protection in the following terms :-...”

4] The learned counsel submits that the applicant has cooperated with the investigation. Considering the submissions and the reasons given in the order dated 12.03.2025, the interim protection can be confirmed.

5] In view of the above, the interim protection granted by order dated 12.03.2025 stands confirmed, on the following terms:

i] The applicant shall attend the police station as and when required by the Investigating Officer.

ii] The applicant shall not tamper with the evidence of the prosecution in any manner. He shall not influence the informant, witnesses and other persons concerned with the case.

iii] The applicant shall co-operate with the investigation and also in the proceedings before the trial Court.

6] In the event, the applicant violates any of the conditions specified in this order, it shall be liable to be cancelled.

7] It is also clarified that the observations made in this order are limited to the disposal of the present anticipatory bail application and the trial Court shall proceed further in the matter without being influenced by the observations made hereinabove.

8] The application stands disposed of.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER]
JUDGE