



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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1011/2025

ANIL RANGNATH GAWARE
VS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...APPLICANT

...RESPONDENT

...
Adv. Aniket Vagal for the Applicant.
Adv. Supriya Kak, APP for the Respondent State.
...

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.
DATED : APRIL 17, 2025

P.C.:

1. This is an application Under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of bail in anticipation of his arrest in Crime No.282/2023 registered with Yeola City Police Station, Nashik Rural for the offences punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 387, 506, 120(B) r/w sec.34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. On the basis of complaint, an FIR was lodged. The Role of the applicant is mentioned in the FIR.

3. Mr. Vagal learned counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant is accused no. 8. He submits that the accused no. 1 (Sachin Patil) has been granted pre-arrest bail by this Court by order dated 31 January 2025. Thereafter, pre-arrest bail was also granted to co-accused Dipak Suresh Nagpure by order dated 20 March 2025. He

further submitted that as far as the co-accused Dipak Nagpure is concerned, he was the mere typist to type the documents as per the instruction given to him by parties and advocate, outside the office of the Registrar and he had no role in criminality. In the said documents the present applicant was just a witness, who acted on the instruction of one Shubham Vilas Mundhe (accused no.2). He submits that there are no antecedents as far as the present applicant is concerned. Applicant is ready to comply with the conditions impose by this Court.

4. The learned APP submits that two of the co-accused have been granted pre-arrest bail by this Court. The main role in the crime is of accused no. 1, who has been granted pre-arrest bail. She submits that though the role of the present applicant is that of he being a witness to the alleged document, in order to complete the investigation the custody of the present applicant would be necessary.

5. I have heard the counsel for both the sides and have gone though the documents on record including that of orders passed in two anticipatory bail granted by this Court to the co-accused persons. Considering the alleged role of the present applicant in the crime, he being not the main kingpin of the crime and no antecedents as regards the present applicant, I am convinced that as of today the custody of the present applicant would not be necessary. Hence, I pass the following order.

ORDER

(a) **The anticipatory bail application is allowed.**

(b) In the event of arrest in connection in Crime No. 282/2023 registered with Yeola City Police Station, the applicant shall be released on bail, on furnishing PR. bond to the extent of Rs.30,000/- with one or more sureties of the like amount.

(c) The applicant shall co-operate with the investigation and attend and meet the Investigating Officer of the concerned Police Station as and when called by the investigating officer.

(d) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with facts of case so as to dissuade him from disclosing the facts to Court or any Police Officer and further, the applicant shall not tamper with the evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(e) The applicant shall furnish details of his residential addresses, contact numbers and e-mail addresses to the Investigating Officer.

6. Needless to say, violation of any of the aforesaid conditions would make the applicant liable to face proceedings for cancellation of anticipatory bail. It is clarified that the observations made in this order

are limited to the question of grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant in the present application, and that the trial Court shall proceed further, without being influenced by the observations made in this order.

7. **The anticipatory bail application is disposed off.**

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)