



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 225 OF 2025

Sameer s/o Anil Sonone 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. A.D. Girdekar, counsel for applicant.

Mr. N.B.Jawade, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 16/04/2025.

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.116/2025 registered with Police Station Dabki Road, District Akola for the offence punishable under Section 318 (4) read with Section 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The crime is registered on the basis of a report lodged by Aditya Ganesh Patil alleging that the co-accused, Vedant Rajesh Tiwari, is his school friend and is acquainted with him as such. The co-accused induced him to open a bank account by stating that, his brother is working in a bank and has a target of opening 10 bank accounts. Therefore, so as to help his friend, the complainant agreed to open an account. After opening the account, the passbook and ATM card were kept by the co-accused, and a SIM card, which was registered with the said account, was also given to the co-accused.

The complainant received a notice from Police Station Mulukpulli, District Bhadradi Kothagudem (Telangana) about his account, which is used by the applicant for misappropriation of money, and therefore, notice under Section 91 of the Criminal Procedure Code was served. On the basis of the said report, police have registered the crime against the present applicant.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, who submitted that as far as the present applicant is concerned, there is no specific allegation against him. It is the co-accused who has obtained the said documents from the complainant. Considering no specific role is attributed to the present applicant, his custodial interrogation is not required, and entire documents have already been seized. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. The learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that during the investigation, the involvement of the present applicant is revealed. He invited my attention towards the statement of one Abhinav Pankaj Date, which discloses the involvement of the present applicant in the alleged offence. Thus, the statement shows that the co-accused has obtained the said documents and handed over to the present applicant. The statement of account of the informant is also on record, which shows the transaction which taken place in his account. Thus, considering the prima-facie

material against the present applicant, at this stage, no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. In view of that, I proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

The criminal application is **rejected**.

[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]