



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.342 OF 2025

Mayur s/o Devakram Harinkhede

Vs.

State of Maharashtra, through Police Station Officer, Police Station
Goregaon, District Gondia

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. A. M. Chandekar, Counsel for the applicant.

Ms. T. H. Udeshi, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.

DATED : 24/06/2025

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.200/2025 registered with Police Station Goregaon, District Gondia for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The crime is registered on the basis of report lodged by the Auditor of the Cooperative Society on an allegation that due to audit, it revealed to him that there is a misappropriation of paddy at various centers and the present applicant is one of the center head at Sarvatola. 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 involvement of the present applicant is concerned, it is merely on suspicion. Now the investigation is already completed and the custodial interrogation of the present applicant is not required. The dispute is already pending before the learned Cooperative Court. As far as the custodial interrogation is concerned, the applicant is ready to cooperate and he has already attended the Police Station.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that during the investigation, it reveals that there was unreasonable decrease of paddy stocks at different centers because of which new office bearers of the Society had taken said decision to provide paddy to the rice millers by purchasing the same. By agreement, the applicant has taken the responsibility to perform his duty diligently, which he has not done, and therefore, his custodial interrogation is required.

5. On hearing both sides and on perusal of the investigation papers, it reveals that the investigation is practically completed. The dispute is also pending before the Cooperative Court. As far as the custodial interrogation is concerned, the applicant has already cooperated with the investigating agency. In view of that, his physical custody is not required and therefore, interim protection requires to

be confirmed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass following order:

ORDER

- (i) The application is allowed.
- (ii) The interim protection granted to the present applicant by order dated 16.05.2025 is hereby confirmed on the condition that the applicant shall attend the concerned Police Station once in a month i.e. on 15th of every month, till the conclusion of the trial.
- (iii) The applicant shall not induce, threat or promise to any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the case.

The application is disposed of.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)