



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

955 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1748 OF 2024

KAKASAHEB MAHADEO SANAP

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...

Advocate for Applicant: Mr. Prashant D. Suryawanshi a/w. Mr. A. R. Tapse
APP for Respondent/State: Ms. Neha B. Kamble

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 27th 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.0799/2024, dated 13.08.2024, registered with Pathardi Police Station, District Ahmednagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.
3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant was working in the Tahsil office, Pathardi as Computer Operator and there was a scheme floated by the Government namely "*Anandach Shidha*", in which the ration shop owner was required to deposit amount of Rs.45,000/-. The applicant has taken the work of deposit of these amounts from 153 ration shop owners. That the applicant had also taken this work from the informant and he had taken money of Rs.45,214/-, however, he did not deposit the amount towards

the ration goods supplied to the informant and the informant received the notice from the Collector Office for the payment of Rs.45,214/-. It is stated that the applicant had similarly taken money from various person who runs ration shops amounting to Rs.50,00,000/- approximately and has cheated them, resulting in lodging of the present FIR.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has stopped working from the year 2021 and, as such, allegations of March-2023 till December-2023 is incorrect one and the same is only made on account of some political rivalry.

5. The learned APP submits that the prosecution has recorded statements of at least 32 ration shop owner. They have all stated that they have paid the money and that the applicant was expected to deposit the same, which he did not and, due to which, now, they have received the notice from the Collector Office for payment of dues.

6. Prima facie, the involvement of the present applicant in the crime is seen and thorough investigation is required.

7. Considering the above, the Anticipatory Bail Application stands dismissed.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

marathe