



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1656 OF 2025

Amol Mohan Tahakik
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra

...

- Dr. Anagha N. Pedgaonkar, Advocate h/f. Mr. E. G. Irale, Advocate for Applicant
- Ms. D. S. Jape, APP for Respondent- State

...

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.

DATED : 19.11.2025

PER COURT :

1. The applicant has approached this Court seeking regular bail in connection with FIR bearing Crime No. 608 of 2024, dated 20.07.2024, registered with Shevgaon Police Station, Tq. Shevgaon, District Ahmednagar for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 409, 420, 201 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999.

2. The basic contention of the learned counsel for the applicant is that the applicant was arrested on 01.09.2024 and has been behind bars for almost 14 months. It is submitted that, considering the number of witnesses required to be examined during the trial, the

applicant may be released on bail, particularly in view of the period of incarceration already undergone. It is further submitted that the applicant was merely working as a receptionist in VK Trading Solutions and Share Marketing Business Company and had no role in inducing investors or handling investments. According to the learned counsel, the applicant's limited role was only to issue receipts after the investors deposited money in the company, which was the brainchild of the main accused, Vaibhav Kokate. The learned counsel further submits that the applicant is not even named in the First Information Report and, considering his limited role, he may be released on bail.

3. As against this, the learned APP vehemently opposes the grant of bail on the ground that a huge fraud has been committed by the main accused, Vaibhav Kokate, in connivance with the present applicant, Amol Mohan Tahakik, who was working in the same office. She submits that there is sufficient material on record indicating the involvement of the applicant in the commission of the said offence. She relies upon the statements of witnesses, including Manohar Ghortale and Ashok Tahakik, to establish the role of the applicant, apart from several other witnesses who have named the applicant as one of the co-conspirators in the economic offence. The learned APP further relies on the applicant's bank account statements to show that

substantial amounts were transferred to his account either by investors or by the main accused, which prima facie demonstrates that the applicant was not merely a receptionist but was also involved in conducting and managing the affairs of VK Trading Solutions and Share Marketing Business Company. She therefore prays for rejection of the bail application considering the magnitude and enormity of the crime.

4. I have gone through the material relied upon by the learned APP as well as the statements which form part of the charge-sheet filed along with the present application. The statements of Manohar and Ashok, no doubt, indicate the role of the present applicant. Nevertheless, from the bank statements and the statements of several witnesses, it can be prima facie gathered that the applicant was actively involved in managing the affairs of VK Trading Solutions. Furthermore, a Single Judge of this Court, while considering the bail application of co-accused Rushikesh Dnyaneshwar Kokate in Bail Application No. 507 of 2025 (decided on 06.05.2025), was pleased to reject the bail application and also made observations concerning the role of the present applicant. The fraud is alleged to be to the tune of approximately Rs. 7,55,63,000/-, and the statements recorded by the Investigating Officer reveal that around 700 people have been cheated under the schemes floated by the main accused, Vaibhav

Kokate, in connivance with the present applicant. As of the date when the application of co-accused Rushikesh Kokate was decided, statements of 144 witnesses had been recorded, and it is informed that several more complainants continue to come forward with allegations of cheating by the said company.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of ***Jagan Mohan. Reddy V CBI., AIR 2013 SC 1933***, has held that economic offences constitute a class apart, and the parameters for deciding bail in such cases are different, as these offences have the tendency to affect the economic fabric of the country. Considering the nature and seriousness of the allegations, I am not inclined to grant bail to the present applicant.

6. Needless to say, the observations made in this order are limited to the disposal of the present bail application and the Trial Court shall proceed further in the matter without being influenced by the observations made hereinabove.

7. The application, therefore, stands rejected and disposed of accordingly.

(MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.)