

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2499 OF 2024

Pralhad P. Shirodkar

...Applicant

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

...Respondents.

DINESH
SADANAND
SHERLA

Digitally signed by
DINESH
SADANAND
SHERLA
Date: 2025.10.17
17:59:10 +0530

.....
 Mr. Kanchanpurkar Gautam Tatoba for the Applicant.

Mrs. Rutuja Ambekar, APP for the Respondent/State.

Ms Keral Mehta, Appointed Advocate for Respondent No.2.

PSI Yogesh Chinchole, Vikhroli Police Station present.

.....

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 08.10.2025.

P.C. :

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail.
2. The applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No. 337 of 2024 registered at Vikhroli Police Station for the offence punishable under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).
3. It is the case of the prosecution that the applicant is the owner of a jewellery shop namely "S.S. Shirodkar Jewellers". The complainant is acquainted with the applicant and as such has purchased gold and silver ornaments from him for the past 20 years. On 8th November 2015, the complainant had purchased 2 gold bangles of 40 grams for Rs.1,23,785/- from the applicant. Subsequently on 14th November 2021, the complainant handed over the said gold bangles to the applicant for the purpose of remaking the same into a new design. Accordingly, the applicant

accepted the said gold bangles and issued receipts for the same. However, later the applicant failed to return the said gold bangles to the complainant as promised by him. Consequently, the present crime was registered on the basis of the complaint lodged by the complainant.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant, the learned APP appearing for the respondent/State and the learned counsel for respondent No.2/first informant.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant was willing to return the ornaments, however, due to certain unavoidable circumstances, the ornaments could not return to the first informant. It is submitted that from the allegations it cannot be inferred that, since, inception the intent of the applicant was to cheat the first informant. It is submitted that in terms of order passed by this Court dated 6th September 2024, the present applicant has already deposited Rs.2,25,000/- with the registry of this Court.

6. On the other hand, learned APP for the respondent/State and the learned counsel for respondent No.2/first informant submit that custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary to recover the ornaments. It is submitted that considering the nature of crime, the applicant may not be released on anticipatory bail.

7. I have perused the first information report. The fact that the

applicant has not returned the ornaments to the first informant for the period of three years is sufficient at this stage to draw an inference that the intent of the applicant was to cheat the first informant. Considering overall facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail. Hence, the Application is rejected.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]