

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No.2086 of 2025

1. Sangeeta Ramesh Chhatpar,
Adult, Age : 68 yrs,
R/at A/102, Nikhileshwara Complex,
Section 25, Ulhasnagar-421004.
Dist. Thane.

2. Vithoba Govind Khot
Adult, Age: 42 yrs,
R/at Flat No.303, A Wing
Nikhileshwara Complex,
Section 25, Ulhasnagar-421004.
Dist. Thane.

... Applicants.

Vs.

State of Maharashtra
(through Sr PI Vitthalwadi
Police Station, Vitthalwadi
Ulhasnagar, Mumbai.

... Respondent.

Mr Amit Singh for the applicant.
Mr Arfan Sait, APP for the respondent / State.

Coram : R.N.Laddha, J.
Date : 29 July 2025.

P.C. :

The applicants apprehend arrest in connection with

CR No.I-405 of 2025, registered at Vitthalwadi Police Station, Thane City, for offences punishable under Sections 417, 465, and 468 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, and have filed the present application seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. According to the prosecution, the informant is a *bona fide* member of the Shree Nikhileshwara Cooperative Housing Society located in Ulhasnagar. It is stated that between 11 January 2024 and 19 January 2024, the informant was out of the country on a family vacation in Singapore. Despite his absence, a Special General Body Meeting of the said housing society was conveyed on 14 January 2024. Shockingly, upon reviewing the attendance register for that meeting, it was discovered that at serial No.48, the informant's name had been marked with a forged signature, falsely indicating his presence. When the informant later raised queries regarding this discrepancy with applicants, who are the President and Secretary of the said society, they provided vague and evasive responses.

3. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submits that the applicants have been falsely

implicated in the present case, and the allegations made against them are baseless and motivated. He contends that the FIR does not attribute any specific role to the present applicants and merely contains vague and general allegations, lacking in particularity or substantive details.

4. The learned Counsel further submits that during the meeting in question, fifty members of the society were present and no grievances or objections were raised by any of the attendees, except the informant, regarding the conduct of the applicants during the said meeting. This reinforces the contention that the allegations are isolated and do not reflect the consensus or concerns of the society at large. Furthermore, the FIR does not allege that either the informant or any third party suffered any financial or personal loss as a result of the purported forged signature of the informant. There is also no assertion that the applicants derived any undue benefit from the alleged act. The entire case hinges on documentary evidence, which is already in the custody of the investigation officer or is available at the office of the society. The learned Counsel further submits that the applicants have not been served with any prior notice as mandated under the provisions of the Bharatiya

Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023. The applicants are willing and ready to cooperate with the investigation. They undertake to appear before the investigating officer as and when required and are prepared to furnish all relevant documents as well as their specimen signatures and handwritings for examination.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/ State, submits that serious allegations have been made against the applicants, specifically accusing them of having forged the informant's signature in the society register during an official society meeting. The documents in question, which are central to the alleged offence, have not yet been recovered.

6. Upon perusing the records, it appears that the applicants stand accused of having forged the informant's signature in the society's register during a purported society meeting. The records indicate that approximately fifty members were in attendance at the said meeting. The informant has not alleged that he or any other person was deceived, misled, or suffered any tangible loss or harm as a consequence of the alleged fabrication of his signature.

Furthermore, the applicants have expressed their willingness to cooperate with the investigation. They are prepared to produce the society's register before the investigating officer and are also ready to furnish their specimen signatures and handwriting samples for verification/ examination. All the allegations pertained to the documentary evidence, which the applicants are voluntarily offering to submit. Given that the investigation appears to have progressed significantly and considering the cooperative stance adopted by the applicants, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the relief sought. Accordingly, the application is allowed on the following terms :

(i) In the event of the applicants' arrest in connection with CR No.I-405 of 2025, registered at Vitthalwadi Police Station, Thane City, they shall be released on bail upon executing a PR Bond of Rs.25,000/- each and furnishing one or more sureties in the like amount.

(ii) The applicants shall attend the concerned Police Station on 4, 5 and 6 August 2025, between 11:00 a.m. and

2:00 p.m. and thereafter as and when required by the investigating officer and shall surrender the documents required by the investigating officer, provide their specimen signatures and handwritings.

(iii) The applicants shall not indulge in any activities that may tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses.

7. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

[R. N. Laddha, J.]