



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 374 OF 2025

Rahimuddin s/o Hamiduddin Qazi 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. P.P. Jamnik, counsel for applicant.

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

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 23/06/2025.

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No. 973/2024 registered with Police Station Gittikhadan, Nagpur for the offence punishable under Sections 3(5), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 339 and 340(1) of the Bhartiya Nyaya 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 on 13/12/2024, alleging that Crime Branch, Nagpur, received secret information that some vehicles were stolen from other states, had been to the R.T.O., Nagpur, for registration, and are presently parked at NIT Parking Plaza, Kamptee Road, Nagpur. Therefore, the informant, along with other staff, reached there and saw that one truck, bearing No. MH-40-BL-8264, was standing there in suspicious condition. On inquiry with the security guard, it was found that said truck had been parked there for the last three months. After that, the police officer contacted the

registered owner of the said truck but failed to contact. After technical analysis, it was revealed that said truck was stolen and fraudulently registered at Maharashtra R.T.O. Hence, on the basis of the report, police have registered the crime against the present applicant.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, who submitted that the name of the present applicant is not appearing in the FIR. The applicant has already attended the concerned police station and cooperated with the investigating agency. Recently, he came to know that he is arraigned as an accused therefore, he approached the Sessions Court for grant of anticipatory bail, but it was rejected. He submitted that as far as custodial interrogation is concerned, which is not required, and also he is not concerned with the alleged offence. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that during the investigation, it revealed that the chassis number and engine number were forged by the present applicant, and on the basis of the said forged documents, he has obtained the loan from the financial institutions.

He further invited my attention towards the letter issued by the RTO Arunachal Pradesh, which shows that manufacturer of the said chassis has informed that the said chassis was not manufactured by them, and therefore, it does not belong to the vehicle which is sold in Arunachal

Pradesh. Thus, he submitted that modus operandi of the present applicant is unique, and therefore, his custodial interrogation is required for the investigation purpose.

5. After having gone through the investigation papers, it reveals that several vehicles were brought for the registration at Nagpur, and therefore, the entire racket came into the knowledge of the investigating agency. The investigating officer investigated the matter, and it revealed to him that the present applicant had prepared forged documents for the vehicle of another state and, by using such forged documents, registered another vehicle and got sanctioned for the loan on that vehicle.

6. Considering the role attributed to the present applicant, admittedly his custodial interrogation is required, and therefore, the application deserves to be rejected. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order.

Criminal Application is **rejected**.

[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]