



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.192 OF 2025
(Parmeshwar Ramdas Wankhede Vs. 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. S.A. Mohta, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. V.A. Thakare, APP for the State.

CORAM:- URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED :- APRIL 3, 2025.

Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.17/2025 registered with Police Station Pimpalgaon Raja, Tahsil Khamgaon, District Buldhana for the offences punishable under Sections 3(5), 318(4), 336(1), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(1), 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The crime is registered on an allegation that the other co-accused had submitted the forged income certificate to avail the facility under the Sanjay Gandhi Niradhar Yojana. It is further alleged that the co-accused is illiterate and studied upto 3rd standard and he has approached to the Tulsi Photo Studio on the say of the officials of the said office and said Tulsi Photo Studio owner had provided him the said certificate. The present applicant is the owner of the said Tulsi Photo Studio.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that only the allegation against the present applicant is

that certificate is prepared on a computer which is installed in the studio of the present applicant. No other allegations are levelled, his custodial interrogation is not required. His computer is already seized. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the application and submitted that the order passed by this Court in Criminal Application (ABA) No.130 of 2025 specifies the role of the present applicant. As far as custodial interrogation is concerned which is required to ascertain the *modus operandi* of the present applicant and the other officials in the present crime. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. I have heard learned Counsel for both the sides. Perused the investigation papers from which it reveals that it is the present applicant in whose studio the said forged certificate was prepared which was used by the co-accused to have a pecuniary benefits on the basis of the said certificate. Thus, considering the allegation against the present applicant, the *prima facie* case is made out. Thus, application deserves to be rejected.

6. Hence, the application is rejected accordingly.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)