

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No.2193 of 2025

Sandeep Narayan Chonde
Age 36 years, Occ-Business,
R/o- Shree Lane, Kalamb,
Taluka Kalamb, District Kolhapur

... Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra
(Through Rajarampuri Police Station)

... Respondent

Mr Anil S Kamble, for the applicant.

Mr Prashant Pandurang Jadhav, APP, for the respondent/ State.
API VR Patole, Juna Rajwada Police Station, is present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 6 August 2025.

P.C.:

By this application, the applicant seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with CR No.61 of 2017, registered at Rajarampuri Police Station, Kolhapur, for offences punishable under Sections 454, 457, 380, 411 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the complainant, a retired PWD Sub-Engineer, lives with his wife in Kolhapur. On

26 February 2017, they went to Pune after locking their house. On 2 March 2017, a neighbour informed them that the door had been broken. The complainant returned the same night and discovered a theft involving gold, silver ornaments, and cash worth about Rs.73,500/-. He lodged the FIR on the next day at Rajarampuri Police Station. The investigation later revealed that the applicant had received this stolen property from the co-accused.

3. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. It is submitted that six co-accused persons have already been arrested, charge sheeted and have pleaded guilty, pursuant to which they have been convicted by the learned trial Court. The applicant was neither named in the FIR nor is there any cogent or credible material on record to establish his involvement in the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the applicant is a *bona fide* businessman and has never been involved in the purchase or possession of stolen gold ornaments.

4. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/State, submits that although the offence in question was committed in the year

2017, the applicant has remained unavailable for investigation. It is submitted that the co-accused have been charge sheeted and subsequently convicted. The applicant purchased stolen gold ornaments from the co-accused, who were involved in the commission of the offence of criminal house-trespass and theft. Furthermore, it is contended that the stolen gold articles are yet to be recovered, and the investigation *qua* the applicant remains pending and incomplete.

5. Upon perusing the records, it appears that the alleged incident took place in March 2017. The co-accused have already been charge sheeted and convicted by the learned trial Court. There exists sufficient material on record to *prima facie* show the involvement of the present applicant in the commission of the offence. The record further shows that the applicant's shop was found closed, and he has remained unavailable for the purposes of investigation. There is *prima facie* material available on record to indicate that the applicant purchased the stolen gold ornaments from the co-accused. The said stolen articles are yet to be recovered. Additionally, the applicant has four criminal antecedents of a similar nature.

6. Considering, the nature of allegations, the pending recovery of stolen property, the applicant's previous criminal

history involving similar offences, and his continued abscondence since 2017, this Court is not inclined to exercise its discretion in favour of the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)