

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

Bail Application No.3117 of 2025

Raju @ Ranjitsinh Fatubha Parmar

Age 38 years, Occ. Labour,

R/o. Ranpur Kakriya Chawra,

Tal.- Ranpur, Dist.- Botad.

... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

(Through Nigdi Police Station,

Dist. Pune)

... Respondent

Mr Chaitanya Mulawkar, a/w Mr Nilesh Waghmode, for the Applicant.

Mr B B Kulkarni, APP, for Respondent / State.

PSI Mahesh Satpute, Nigdi Police Station, Pune.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 11 December 2025

P.C.:

By this application, the applicant seeks bail in connection with CR No.302 of 2021, registered at Nigdi Police Station, Pune, for offences punishable under Sections 489A, 489B, 489C, and 489D read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that on 23 June 2021, at approximately 4:00 p.m., accused No.1 was intercepted on a

public roadway situated in front of the Nigdi Cremation Ground, whereupon he was allegedly found in unlawful possession of counterfeit currency notes having a face value of Rs.5,86,000/-. Pursuant to further investigation, it is alleged that accused No.5 and the present applicant (arraigned as accused No.6) utilised a laptop computer and printer purportedly owned by accused No.5 for the purpose of manufacturing and reproducing counterfeit currency notes. The prosecution asserts that these forged currency notes were thereafter delivered to accused Nos.1 to 4 with the intention and object of putting them into circulation.

3. Mr Chaitanya Mulawkar, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant, submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the applicant is not named in the FIR, and his alleged involvement has surfaced solely on the basis of a co-accused's statement, which, it is submitted, is inadmissible in evidence and insufficient to establish *prima facie* culpability. The learned Counsel further submits that the recovery of counterfeit currency notes was effected exclusively from accused No.1, who, notably, has not attributed any role to the present applicant in the commission of the alleged offence. It is urged that there is no material on record to suggest any direct

or indirect nexus between the applicant and the contraband in question.

4. It is further submitted that the applicant is similarly situated, if not on a better footing, than the other co-accused, five out of six of whom have already been enlarged on bail. In particular, reference is made to accused No.3, who, despite having antecedents of a similar nature, has been granted the benefit of bail. The applicant, who has no criminal antecedents to his discredit, is therefore entitled to claim parity in the matter of bail.

5. The learned Counsel further points out that the applicant has been languishing in jail since 10 July 2021. Although the charge sheet has been filed, the trial has not progressed, and charges are yet to be framed. It is submitted that the investigation *qua* the applicant is complete, and no further recovery or discovery is pending at his instance. In such circumstances, the continued incarceration of the applicant would amount to pre-trial punishment. The applicant is a permanent resident of the jurisdiction, has deep roots in society, and is neither a flight risk nor in a position to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. He is ready and willing to abide by any conditions that this Court may deem fit and proper to impose.

6. On the other hand, Mr BB Kulkarni, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/ State, opposes the applicant's request for bail. He submits that specific and well-substantiated allegations have been levelled against the applicant. The applicant has actively participated in the commission of the offence, and the offence is of a grave and serious nature. The learned APP raised apprehensions that the applicant may tamper with the prosecution evidence and influence witnesses, should bail be granted.

7. This Court has given anxious consideration to the rival contentions canvassed across the Bar and perused the records.

8. It appears from the record that the allegations levelled against the applicant pertain to the alleged participation in the preparation and circulation of counterfeit currency notes. The role ascribed to the applicant appears to be substantially similar to that attributed to accused No.5, who has already been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 19 March 2025. The incriminating material that is the laptop and printer purportedly utilised in the commission of the alleged offence was recovered from accused No.5 and not from the present applicant. It is further not in dispute that accused Nos.1 to 5 have all been enlarged on bail. The applicant, however, has remained incarcerated since 10 July 2021, and the investigating

agency has not indicated that any further recovery or discovery is to be effected from him. Although the charge sheet came to be filed as early as September 2021, the framing of charges has not yet taken place. The prosecution proposes to examine 30 witnesses, and given the current stage of the proceedings, the conclusion of the trial is not foreseeable in the near future. Furthermore, the applicant does not have any prior criminal antecedents. The apprehensions expressed by the learned APP regarding the possibility of tampering with evidence and influencing witnesses can be addressed by imposing appropriate conditions.

9. In light of the foregoing, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

- (i) The applicant shall be released on bail in CR No.302 of 2021, registered at Nigdi Police Station, Pune, upon executing a PR Bond of Rs.25,000/- and furnishing one or more sureties in the like amount.
- (ii) The applicant, himself or through any other person, shall not tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses.

(iii) The applicant shall regularly attend and cooperate with the trial Court for the expeditious disposal of the case.

10. The application stands disposed of accordingly

(R.N. Laddha, J.)