IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 234 OF 2025

Satishkumar Shivlal Rokde ...Applicant
Versus
State Of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Ankit R. Takle, i/b. Mr. Tarsen Singh Gabbi, Advocate for the Applicant.

Ms. Pallavi N. Dabholkar, APP for the State.

Ms. Vaishali Shravgi, East Region Cyber Police Station Crime Branch, Mumbai present.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATED : 17 MARCH 2025

P.C.:

1. The applicant apprehends arrest at the hands of Cyber Police Station, East Region in connection with FIR No.179/2024 registered for offence punishable under Sections 420, 468, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 66 (D) of the Information Technology Act and thus seeks the relief of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. The FIR has been lodged by the informant, alleging that during the period from 22 May 2024 to 4 July 2024, a woman who introduced

herself as Naina Venkatesh contacted him through WhatsApp. She informed him about an investment opportunity in forex trading, promising substantial returns. A sum of Rs. 25,49,200/- was received from the informant.

2. It is alleged that a criminal conspiracy was hatched by the accused, Naina Venkatesh, along with all other accused, including the present applicant. As the monies were not returned, the FIR was lodged.

3. On the last occasion, I had directed the present applicant to attend the concerned police station for the purpose of recording his statement. I have been informed that, accordingly, on 13 March 2025, the applicant attended the concerned police station, and his statement was recorded. In the said statement, the applicant admitted that he had received a sum of Rs.10,000/- from the arrested accused No. 1, Prashant Manohar Tembhurnikar.

4. On the last occasion, i.e., 10th March 2025, as I sought to ascertain whether the informant's account was opened in the State Bank of India and in which department of the said bank the present applicant was employed Mr. Takle, the learned Advocate for the applicant, informed the Court that the applicant was working with the Bank of India, Gondia Branch. This statement by Advocate Takle was recorded by me in the order dated 10 March 2025.

5. Today, Mr. Takle, the learned Advocate for the applicant, informed

the Court that the applicant is, in fact, not working with the State Bank of India but is employed with ICICI Bank. He submits that the custody of the present applicant is not necessary as he has cooperated with the police.

6. The learned APP submits that after the statement of the present applicant was recorded by the police, it was discovered that the applicant has antecedents in Odisha. Similarly, after the mobile phone of arrested accused No. 1 was seized by the police and examined, it was found that, apart from Odisha, an FIR had also been lodged against the accused in Karnataka.

7. Furthermore, summons received from the Karnataka Court by arrested accused No. 1 were forwarded by him to the present applicant (accused No. 4). The learned APP submits that the present applicant is not telling the truth and is not cooperating with the police in disclosing the complete trail of the money involved.

8. I have considered the FIR and the various statements recorded by the police. After reviewing the same, it is evident that the present applicant, who has now been identified as an employee of ICICI Bank, has no concern in the operations of the State Bank of India, where the subject account was opened.

9. Therefore, I am satisfied that the present applicant, being an

employee of ICICI Bank, would have no reason to be involved with another bank where accounts were opened. However, it appears that the account opening kit, which is received by customers, was in the custody of the present applicant, despite he being employed at ICICI Bank. The applicant had no legitimate reason to possess such a kit.

10. Furthermore, it has been observed that monies were transferred by arrested accused No. 1 to the present applicant upon the opening of each account. There is no justification for the receipt of these funds. It also appears that the present applicant forwarded the subject bank account opening kit to an individual in Delhi.

11. In addition to the offence registered against the present applicant in this case, there are also criminal cases registered against him in the Court of Odisha. Moreover, an FIR has been registered Accused person him in Karnataka as well.

12. Hence, I am satisfied that the applicant has antecedents and is not cooperating with the police in the investigation.

13. In such a circumstances, according to me, no case is made out to grant any kind of protection to the Applicant. Hence, **the Anticipatory Bail Application is rejected.**

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)