



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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 606/2025

SONU RAJENDRA BAHADUR SINGH ..APPLICANT
VS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA ..RESPONDENT

Adv. U. L. Singh a/w. Adv. Manoj Gupta for applicant.
Mr. A. A. Naik, APP for State.
PSI Vinod Wagh, Manikpur Police Station.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATE : MARCH 18, 2025.

P.C. :

1. This application is filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) for seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with the First Information Report (FIR) No.210/2024 registered with the Manikpur Police Station, District Mira-Bhayandar, Vasai-Virar, for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 406 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 3 of the MPID Act.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the present applicant along with his brother and other accused persons duped the

informant and other witnesses by inducing them to invest their monies for purchasing house at a cheaper rate and accordingly, cheated them for an amount of Rs.3,21,70,000/-. As neither house nor the monies were returned back, an FIR has been lodged.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that though accused no.1 is the brother of the present applicant, the present applicant has no role to play in the crime. Except one paragraph mentioned in the complaint, there are no allegations made against the present applicant. He submits that there are no criminal antecedents reported against the applicant and the applicant is ready to cooperate with the police.

4. The learned APP submits that the present applicant is the brother of the main accused who is behind the bars. He submits that there are at least 115 persons who have complaint against present applicant. The crime has been registered for the offence under IPC and also under Section 3 of the MPID Act. He submits that if the present applicant is granted bail, there is a possibility of the applicant tampering with the prosecution witnesses. Hence, the present application should be rejected.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the

learned APP for the State. I have also gone through the documents on record.

6. It is the case of the informant in the complaint alleged along with the FIR that the informant had booked two rooms and paid consideration of Rs.15,30,000/- by cash and cheque. Accordingly, an agreement was executed, but however, the rooms were never allotted to him neither the amount paid by him was returned back. At present 115 people have come forward to complain against the present applicant. It is also the submission of the State that the accused have purchased properties at their native place at Uttar Pradesh. The IO has recorded the statements of the witnesses which show that the present applicant was present along with other accused when the witnesses had attended the office for the purpose of booking their flats. The physical presence of the present applicant is necessary for the purpose of interrogation. Hence, no case is made out to grant pre-arrest bail to the present applicant. **The anticipatory bail application is rejected and disposed of accordingly.**

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)