

Laxmi Sontakke
(P.A.)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

BAIL APPLICATION NO.1840 OF 2025

LAXMI
SUBHASH
SONTAKKE

Digitally signed by
LAXMI SUBHASH
SONTAKKE
Date: 2025.05.07
14:49:04 +0530

Rajas Dattatray Chavan

.. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

.. Respondent

.....

- Mr. Uday Warunjikar a/w Raturaj Karande, Jenish Jain, Gaurav Jadhav and Pushpak Kawade, Advocates for Applicant.
- Mr. D. J. Haldankar, APP for the State.

.....

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : MAY 05, 2025

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Warunjikar, learned Advocate for Applicant and Mr. Haldankar, learned APP for Respondent.

2. This is an Application under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.') seeking Bail in connection with C.R. No. 145 registered with Badlapur East Police Station for offences punishable under Sections 318(4) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The Applicant has no antecedents and is a resident of Pune. He is arrested on 27th February, 2025 and is in incarceration since then. There are total three accused persons. The case against the present Applicant arrayed as accused No.2 is that he facilitated and introduced accused No.1 to invest in the project/developments of the

first informant-complainant. Accused No.2 is accomplice who accompanied accused No.1 during the said transactions and meetings with the first informant-complainant.

4. Learned Advocate Mr. Warunjikar would persuade the Court to consider the fact that apart from merely introducing accused No.1 to the first informant, there is no significant role whatsoever played by the Applicant in the alleged crime. He would submit that the the total amount involved in the present crime is Rs. 2 Lacs for which the first informant-complainant has been duped. According to prosecution case, he would submit that the Applicant is not a beneficiary and has not benefitted either directly or indirectly from the aforesaid transactions between the co-accused persons and the first informant complainant.

4.1. He would also inform the Court that post arrest of Applicant, the matter has been listed before the trial court on 63 dates and has been adjourned from time to time. The submission made by Dr. Warunjikar appears to be *prima facie* true and strongly in favour of Applicant to seek bail.

5. Learned Prosecutor appearing in the matter shall take appropriate instructions on the precise role of Applicant and inform the Court as to whether he is a direct or indirect beneficiary of any amount so as to enable the Court to consider the bail application of the Applicant.

- 6.** In view of paucity of time, application cannot be heard immediately next week.
- 7.** Liberty to the Applicant to move the vacation court if so desired.
- 8.** List the matter on **11th July 2025**.

Laxmi Sontakke

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]