

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2532 OF 2025**

Manoj Raghunath More	...Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
State of Maharashtra	...Respondent

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3720 OF 2025
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2532 OF 2025**

Amar P Maji	...Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
State of Maharashtra	...Respondent

**WITH
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.3082 OF 2025**

Rajaram Raghunath More	...Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
State of Maharashtra	...Respondent

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4685 OF 2025
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.3082 OF 2025**

Amar P Maji	...Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
State of Maharashtra	...Respondent

Mr. Saeed S. Shaikh, Advocate for Applicants.
Mr. S.A. Karmakar, APP for State in ABA 2532 of 2025
Ms. S.K.Gajre, APP for State in ABA No. 3082 of 2025
Mr. Murtuza Noorani a/w Mr. Amey Sirsikar (through VC) for
Respondent No.2- Intervenor.

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.
DATED : 19th December 2025

P.C.:

1. At the outset, Mr. Shaikh, learned Counsel for the Applicant states that he has instructions to withdraw the Anticipatory Bail Application No. 3082 of 2025, which has been filed by Accused No.1 – Rajaram Raghunath More.

2. Accordingly, Anticipatory Bail Application No.3082 of 2025, which is not on board taken on record and allowed to be withdrawn as such.

3. As far as Anticipatory Bail Application No. 2532 of 2025 is concerned, the said application has been filed by Accused No.2 – Manoj Raghunath More.

4. The prosecution case is set out in paragraph 8 of the Order dated 18th August 2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pune in Criminal Bail Application No. 4349 of 2025, which reads as under :

“8. The case of prosecution is that the complainant Amar Pachu Maji is running his business since 30 years

for making gold ornaments. He used to make ornaments as per orders of goldsmiths. Accused Vikas Ingale was familiar to him since 20 years. Both of them are running same business, therefore, complainant had trust on him. On 16.07.2024, Vikas Ingale and his son in law Rajaram Raghunath More appeared at the shop of complainant. Vikas Ingale acquainted the complainant with his son in law disclosing that the son in law is running business in named and style as "Pooja Jewellers", at Chikhali, Pune. He told the complainant that the son in law has stock of 3 KG gold with him and he wanted to make ornaments, therefore, the complainant become ready to make business transaction with him. On the same day, accused Rajaram More and Manoj More gave fine gold of 676 grams 150 ml.grams to the complainant and asked to make ornaments of 1133 grams 330 mlgrams. The fine gold of 406 grams 180 mlgrams was to be given to the complainant after deducting fine gold of 676 grams 150 mlgrams. The accused were ready to give the gold of same weight to him and taken the ornaments but he did not return the said gold to the complainant and thereby committed the breach of trust.

5. It is the submission of Mr. Shaikh, learned Counsel for the Applicant that the Applicant has no role to play in the incident. Learned Counsel submitted that the Applicant was merely present when the incident in question took place. He submits that the

Applicant has signed the Agreement (वचन चिह्नी) dated 22nd October 2024 as witness, which has been executed between the First Informant and the Accused No.1- Rajaram More who is proprietor of Pooja Jewellers. He submits that Accused No.1- Rajaram More is involved in the crime. The present Applicant is not involved in the crime. He submits that there are no antecedents. It is the submission of Mr. Shaikh that although Agreement (वचन चिह्नी) dated 22nd October 2024 has been executed by the First Informant, the same is not mentioned in the F.I.R.

6. On the other hand, Mr. Karmakar, learned APP for the State and Mr. Murtuza Noorani, learned Counsel for the Respondent No.2 strongly oppose the Application. Both of them submit that the Applicant is involved in the crime and therefore custodial interrogation is necessary. Both of them submit that the offence is very serious.

7. Perusal of the record shows that although the offence is very serious, however, it is required to be noted that in the F.I.R., which has been lodged on 23rd June 2025, the said Agreement (वचन चिह्नी) dated 22nd October 2024 executed between the First

Informant and Accused No. 1- Rajaram More has not been disclosed.

8. Perusal of said Agreement (वचन चिह्नी) dated 22nd October 2024 shows that the Accused No.1- Rajaram More is responsible for the said missing gold. Said Rajaram More, i.e. Accused No.1 is the proprietor of Pooja Jewellers, in which shop, the incident has taken place. The present Applicant has signed the said Agreement (वचन चिह्नी) merely as a witness. There are no antecedents.

9. Accordingly, in the facts and circumstances, the case is made out for grant of Anticipatory Bail Application. Hence, following Order is passed:

ORDER

- (i) In the event of arrest, the Applicant - Manoj Raghunath More be released on bail in C.R. No.121 of 2025 registered with Faraskhana Police Station, Pune City, on executing P.R. bond of Rs.50,000/- and furnishing one or two sureties in the like amount.

- (ii) The Applicant shall attend the concerned Police Station as and when called by the Police and shall co-operate with the investigation.
- (iii) The Applicant shall furnish his cell phone number and residential address to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated, in case of any change thereto.
- (iv) The Applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat, or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade such a person from disclosing the facts to the Court or to any Police personnel.
- (v) The Applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence and shall not contact or influence the Complainant, or any witness, in any manner.

10. The Anticipatory Bail Application is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

11. In view of disposal of the Anticipatory Bail Applications, nothing survives in the Interim Applications and the same are also disposed of.

(MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.)