

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO.760 OF 2025**

|                      |               |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Ajitkumar Sunil Dey  | .. Applicant  |
| <b>Versus</b>        |               |
| State Of Maharashtra | .. Respondent |

**WITH**  
**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.90 OF 2025**  
**IN**  
**CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO.760 OF 2025**

|                      |               |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Ajitkumar Sunil Dey  | .. Applicant  |
| <b>Versus</b>        |               |
| State Of Maharashtra | .. Respondent |

- .....
- Mr. Sachin Rajepandhare i/by Ram Yadav, Advocate for Applicant.
  - Mr. Sukanta A. Karmakar, APP for State.
- .....

**CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.**

**DATE : MAY 08, 2025**

**P. C.:**

**1.** Heard Mr. Yadav, learned Advocate for Applicant and Mr. Karmakar, learned APP for State.

**2.** Learned Advocate for Applicant has moved present Application bearing Criminal Application No.90 of 2025 for seeking modification of the condition in bail order granted by the Sessions court in October, 2024. Said order is appended at page No.20 of the Application and when operative part of said order is read at page No.26 it is seen that learned Trial Court has directed the Applicant to

deposit an amount of Rs.10,00,000/- as a condition precedent for enlargement on bail. He would persuade the Court to consider the fact that Applicant is unable to meet the said condition since it is an onerous condition. He would submit that neither Applicant has means to fulfill the said condition and would persuade the Court to consider reducing the said amount to Rs.50,000/- otherwise the bail order becomes infructuous and incapable of implementing. He would submit that trial Court after applying its mind has passed the said order but if the condition is onerous, Court should step in and modify the said condition to enable the Applicant to meet the same and get enlarged on bail.

**2.1.** That apart he would submit that Applicant would undertake to attend the trial Court since he has already suffered incarceration.

**3.** Learned APP Mr. Karmakar in his response would submit that the reason and purpose for incorporating the said condition is adequately explained with reasons by the learned trial Court in paragraph Nos.5 and 6 of said order which can be seen at page No.25 of the Application. He would submit that Applicant is a habitual offender who by using the same *modus operandi* has defrauded several persons and received lacs of rupees as deposits from them with a lure and promise to offer them a government job. He would

persuade the Court to consider the fact that even in the present case Applicant has overstepped his limitations by accepting a substantial amount of Rs.24 lacs from the first respondent - complainant and has issued appointment letter on behalf of the Government on a government letter head which has been found to be fake and fabricated. He would submit that there are at least 13 similarly registered offences against the Applicant and incidentally one of the case is listed on Board today alongwith the present application for grant of bail.

**4.** After hearing the learned Prosecutor I direct the prosecution to file their Affidavit-in-Reply to place on record the details which are argued across the bar by the prosecutor to enable the Court to consider the Criminal Application on the next adjourned date.

**5.** Learned Advocate for Applicant is directed to serve a copy of the Application to the learned APP appearing in the matter forthwith as the copy is e-filed and has not been served on the prosecution officer as informed by the learned APP.

**6.** Stand over to 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2025.