

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1373 OF 2025**

Sourabh Namdev Chougale

...Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

Mr. Rahul B. Khot for the applicant

Mr. S. S. Chaudhari APP for the State

Mr. Jeevan Patil, PSI, Bhudargad Police Station

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 18th SEPTEMBER 2025

P.C.

1. The Applicant is apprehending arrest in C.R. No. 70 of 2025 registered with Bhudargad Police Station, District Kolhapur for offences punishable under Sections 3(5), 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 240(2) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (for short “BNS”).

2. It is the prosecution’s case that accused no. 1 had pledged fake gold ornaments in the bank and taken loan on it. It is alleged that said fake gold ornaments were given to accused no. 1 by the applicant.

3. It is the contention of learned counsel for applicant that the

allegations against the applicant are that he had given gold ornaments to the accused no. 1 by taking it from accused no. 4. So the applicant has no role in the said crime. Applicant is on ad-interim relief. He has cooperated in the investigation. Hence, requested to allow the application.

4. It is the contention of learned APP that gold ornaments, having hallmarks were pledged with the bank and loan was obtained on it. Investigating Officer has collected CDR and said CDR shows that there was constant talk between the applicant and accused no. 1. the transcription of it shows that applicant was aware about the fake gold ornaments. It is necessary to make investigation in respect of putting fake hallmark on said gold ornaments and custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. Hence, requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel, perused F.I.R. and documents produced on record. The allegations against the applicant are of supplying fake gold ornaments having fake hallmark. On the fake gold ornaments, fake hallmarks were inscribed. It is very serious. The CDR produced on record shows that applicant and accused no. 1 were in constant touch with each other. It shows involvement of the

applicant. Considering these facts, custodial interrogation of the applicant is required, and I pass following order.

ORDER

(I) The application is rejected.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)

IRESH
MASHAL

Digitally signed by
IRESH MASHAL
Date: 2025.09.23
17:20:45 +0530