

HARSHADA H. SAWANT
(P.A.)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

BAIL APPLICATION NO.1946 OF 2025

Satish Gangadharrao Pillangwad .. Applicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra .. Respondent

-
- Mr. Niranjan Mundargi a/w. Mr. Vinay Bhanushali, Mr. Sanmit Vaze, Ms. Keral Mehta, Mr. Jitesh Bhanushali and Mr. Raj Bhanushali, Advocates for Applicant.
 - Mr. Hitendra J. Dedhia, APP for Respondent.
-

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : MAY 08, 2025

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Mundargi, learned Advocate for Applicant and Mr. Dedhia, learned APP for Respondent.

2. Applicant in the present case is indicted in the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. Appended at page No.52 of the Application is bail order passed by this Court *qua* the Applicant in a companion project wherein role of Applicant in the present crime has also been considered by the Court.

3. Perusal of that order shows that co-accused in the present crime was granted bail alongwith Applicant therein. While granting bail this Court considering the dynamics of the prosecution case, *inter alia*, with respect to allegations in the present First Information Report (for short '**FIR**') and it was observed by the Court that as against the

total liability alleged by First Informant – Complainant to the tune of Rs.60 Crores, prosecution had already recovered rather attached substantial immovable properties to the tune of Rs.113.90 Crores belonging to Applicant.

4. That apart, there are several contours to the present case which have been adequately dealt with by this Court while passing the said order. The aforesaid issues and facts are acknowledged and contained in the Affidavit of the prosecution which was filed in the said C.R. in which bail was granted and which is appended at page No.73 of the Application. Having considered the aforesaid facts, learned Sessions Court has however rejected Application for grant of bail of Applicant on the mere ground that offence is serious and nothing more.

5. When the order dated 21.03.2025 is seen *prima facie* Applicant's further custody is clearly unwarranted.

6. Learned APP shall take appropriate instructions and apprise the reasons as to why further custody of Applicant is required in the present case especially in view of order dated 21.03.2025 appended at page No.52 of the Application.

7. Considering the above and request made, liberty is granted to Advocate for Applicant to move the Vacation Bench in view of the impending summer vacation.

8. It is *prima facie* observed that Affidavit-in-Reply appended at page No.73 of the Application when read *prima facie* covers the present case in the present C.R. also. In that view of the matter, prosecution will take express instructions and accordingly apprise the Court with liberty to Applicant to move the Vacation Bench.

9. Stand over to 15th July, 2025.

H. H. SAWANT

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]

HARSHADA
HANUMANT
SAWANT

Digitally signed
by HARSHADA
HANUMANT
SAWANT
Date: 2025.05.08
18:06:12 +0530