

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No.1925 of 2025

Rajendra S Landge ... Applicant.
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent.

Mr Sudeep Pasbola, Sr Advocate a/w Vinay Bhanushali,
Sanmit Vaze and Mr Pujan Patel for the applicant.
Mr Shahaji Shinde-B Panel Counsel a/w Mr SS Pednekar,
APP for the respondent / State.

Coram : R.N.Laddha, J.
Date : 15 July 2025.

P.C. :

The learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the present FIR is fundamentally based on conjunctures and assumptions, lacking any substantive foundation. He submits that the dispute in question had already been amicably resolved between the aggrieved parties through a settlement/consent agreement, duly recorded. Despite the resolution of the matter, the FIR was registered at a belated stage, with the sole intention of wreaking vengeance against the applicant. The learned Senior Counsel further submits that the applicant has been

falsely implicated in the FIR, primarily on the basis of a statement made by a co-accused. The applicant had been deputed to the concerned police station only between 22 September 2022 and 15 January 2024, and during this tenure, FIR No.207/2023, which pertains to the same subject matter, was investigated by another officer, not by the applicant. The FIR does not attribute any specific or direct role to the applicant in the alleged offence. The principal allegations of forgery, impersonation, and cheating are directed against the co-accused. Moreover, there is no clear averment in the FIR disclosing the essential ingredients of criminal conspiracy. The applicant's purported involvement is based solely on the statement of a co-accused, who is himself an active participant and beneficiary in the alleged transaction. The learned Senior Counsel emphasises that the applicant neither authored, executed, nor submitted any forged or fabricated documents, nor did he engage in any transaction relating to the property in question. According to the learned Senior Counsel, the registration of the present FIR bearing No.195/2025 is legally untenable, particularly in view of the subsistence of FIR No.207/2023, previously registered at the instance of

one Anand Bhagat, covering the same facts and circumstances.

2. The learned Senior Counsel further submits that the applicant is a serving police officer currently posted in the Control Room, Thane. The acts alleged in the present FIR pertain to the discharge of his official duties, and therefore, the applicant is entitled to the protection under Section 45 of the CrPC. The learned Senior Counsel submits that even on a plain reading of the FIR, the essential ingredients constituting an offence u/s 420 of the IPC are not made out. The applicant has not made any false representation nor induced any person to part with property. His name appears in the narrative only at a later stage, when he was asked to contribute funds towards a transaction already negotiated and executed by Anand Bhagat. There is no allegation that the applicant created forged, or presented any fabricated document with the intention of using it as genuine. All such documents, which are now alleged to be forged, are attributed to persons other than the present applicant.

3. The learned Senior Counsel also draws attention to the fact that the ownership dispute in relation to the land in

question was the subject matter of civil suit filed by one Aparna Verma. That suit was ultimately resolved by way of consent terms recorded between the parties, wherein the ownership rights of Aparna Verma were duly acknowledged. Pursuant thereto, the deed was cancelled and the property was lawfully transferred to a third party. Hence, the original dispute stood conclusively settled. The learned Senior Counsel further submits that the present FIR seeks to criminalise what is, at best, a civil dispute that has already been resolved through judicial order. In view of the civil nature of the transaction and the binding settlement between the parties, no cause for criminal prosecution survives.

4. The learned APP, however, seeks time to take instructions. By consent, stand over to **13 August 2025**. In the meanwhile the applicant shall not be arrested in the present crime till the next date.

5. To be listed along with ABA No.1793/2025.

[R. N. Laddha, J.]