



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.48 OF 2025
(Pramod Pandurang Bhagat Vs. The State of Maharashtra)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. VB. Bhise, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. M.K. Pathan, APP for the State.
Mr. D. Ailani, Advocate h/f Mr. U.J. Deshpande, Advocate for Assist to Prosecution.

CORAM:- URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED :- MARCH 7, 2025.

Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.147/2024 registered with Police Station Akot, District Akola for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The allegation against the present applicant is on the basis of report is that he has forged the Will and received the monetary benefits with the help of said forged Will. On the basis of the said report, police have registered the crime.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that there is no compliance in view of Section 41 of the Cr.P.C. He further submitted that the Will is a registered Will and the investigating agency has applied both the sections i.e. 406 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code which

cannot be done. Thus, considering all these aspects, the applicant be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the application and submitted that the involvement of the present applicant revealed from the investigation papers. At this stage, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required as to ascertain in what manner he has committed the offence. Considering the same, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. After hearing both the sides and on perusal of the investigation papers and the statements of the witnesses, the involvement of the present applicant revealed in preparing the forged documents. From the account statement also with the help of the said forged document he has withdrawn the amount. Thus, he has received the pecuniary benefit also. Considering the same, at this stage, the case is not made out for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, the application deserves to be rejected.

6. The application is rejected accordingly.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)