



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 753 OF 2025

Madan Dhondiappa Deshmane

....Applicant

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another

.....Respondent

.....
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Salunke Sudarshan J
APP for Respondents: Mr. A.S. Shinde.

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.
DATE : 10th NOVEMBER, 2025.

P.C. :-

1. The applicant has filed present application seeking his release on bail in connection with Crime No.
2. The counsel for applicant submits that the applicant is ready to cooperate with the investigation as the evidence is documentary in nature and as such, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary.
3. As against this, learned APP submits that there was an inquiry conducted and it was found that the misappropriation to the extent of Rs. 19,31,700/- was done by the present applicant by practically forging the signatures of the medical officer and uploading them on the website for withdrawing huge amounts by transferring them into his own account. He, therefore, submits that the custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary to complete the investigation and to go to the root of the conspiracy.
4. I have gone through the investigation papers, and the FIR. After going through the same, it is found that there is a direct allegation

against the present applicant to have withdrawn huge amount by forging the signatures of the medical officers, wherein, they were entitled for the grants under different schemes run by the Government. The inquiry was conducted by District Health Officer, Jalna and after conducting detailed inquiry, it was found that the present applicant, who was working as Health Assistant, is instrumental in committing the fraud and misappropriation. From the year 2019 onward, under different schemes, present applicant has forged signatures of the Medical Officer and credited the amounts to his personal bank accounts.

5. Thus, in my opinion, custodial interrogation of the applicant would be necessary to unearth the modus-operandi adopted by the applicant and also to obtain relevant documents which are alleged to have been forged by the applicant. As such, this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, application stands rejected.

[MEHROZ K. PATHAN]
JUDGE.

grt/-