IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2113 OF 2025

Sunil Omprakash Singhania and Ors. …Applicants

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr. ...Respondents

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3430 OF 2025

Mr. Sachin Deokar, Advocate for the Applicants.
Ms. A. A. Deshmukh, APP for the Respondent/State.
Adv. Lakshmi Raman a/w Adv. Soumya K., Advocate for Respondent No.2.
Adv. Vinit Jain a/w Adv. Gaurav M., Advocate for Intervener.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 01.12.2025.

P.C. :

1. This is an application for Anticipatory Bail.

2. The applicants are apprehending their arrest in Crime No. 29 of 2025 registered at Worli Police Station, for the offences punishable under Sections 120-B, 417, 418, 420, 403, 409, 465, 467 & 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on 12.08.2023, the applicants introduced to the first informant the idea of investing in a block trading business through their firm ‘SHREE SENSA.’ The

applicants promised the first informant that if he invests in this business, he shall get attractive returns (12% + 5%) per month. Subsequently, the first informant invested total amount of Rs.9.25 Crore from November 2023 to March 2024. It is alleged that when the first informant questioned about the returns, the applicants paid a sum of Rs.1.65 Crore, but the remaining balance of Rs.7.60 Crore remained unpaid. It is further alleged that when the first informant demanded the balance amount, they sent him a fake UTR number. It is alleged that the applicants have used the funds invested by him for their personal use and thereby defrauded the first informant.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicants, the learned APP for the respondent-State and the learned counsel for the first informant.

5. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that false allegations are made against the applicants. In support of the said submission, the learned counsel for the applicants has drawn my attention to the various documents placed on record. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the dispute, if any, between the parties is of civil nature and that there is no

need of custodial interrogation. It is submitted that the applicant Nos. 1 and 2, who have no concern with the firm of applicant Nos. 3 and 4 are also made co-accused.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP for the respondent-State submits that the amount invested by the first informant and other investors was diverted for the personal use. It is submitted that defrauded amount is about to the tune of Rs.29 Crores. It is further submitted that there is one more crime of similar nature registered against the present applicants.

7. I have perused the FIR and the documents placed on record. *Prima-facie,* there appears to be substance in the submission of the learned APP for the respondent-State. The applicants appears to have defrauded the investors to the tune of Rs.29 Crores. The applicants are involved in one more crime of similar nature, Considering the overall facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to release the applicants on anticipatory bail. The application is rejected.

8. Interim application is disposed of.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]