



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

904 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 427 OF 2025

RAJENDRAKUMAR AATMARAM AGARWAL

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Vijay Thorat h/f. Mr. Atul M. Karad

APP for Respondent/State: Mr. N. B. Patil

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 18th MARCH, 2025

PER COURT:

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

2. The applicant has approached this Court apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.121/2022, registered with Kotwali Police Station, District Ahmednagar, now investigated by the EOW Ahmednagar for the offences punishable under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B r/w. 34 of the Indian Penal Code & under Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the MPID Act.

3. This court by order dated 29.01.2025, passed in ABA/2123/2024, rejected the Anticipatory Bail Application of the present applicant.

4. The learned counsel relied upon the order of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Kamlesh Hastimal Gandhi Vs. State of Maharashtra**, dated 06.03.2025, Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).3523/2025 and, also, in the case of **Navneet Shantilal Surpuriya Vs. The State of Maharashtra**, dated 06.03.2025, Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).3602/2025. So also, the order passed by this court in the case of **Girish Kedarnath Lahoti Vs. The State of Maharashtra**, dated 10.03.2025, ABA/186/2025 and prays that on parity the applicant may be granted protection.

5. In the case of the **Girish Kedarnath Lahoti** (*supra*), the applicant therein was the Director of the NUCBL Bank for a period of six days, who had submitted before this court that the material, which is produced on record was not available before this court at the time of rejecting the earlier anticipatory bail application and further contended therein that to the similarly placed applicant the Hon'ble Apex Court in an SLP had granted interim protection. The applicant therein was a Director only for six days and also considering the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order, interim protection was granted to the applicant therein.

6. In the instant case, the applicant was full time Director for the entire period of 2014 – 2019. As such, no parity can be claimed, so

also, this court has already dismissed his earlier Anticipatory Bail Application No.2123 of 2024, no case is made out for anticipatory bail.

7. The Anticipatory Bail Application stands dismissed.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

marathe