



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.506 OF 2025

Vinod Bhagwandas Kalyani

Vs.

State of Maharashtra, through Police Station Officer, Police Station
Narkhed, Nagpur, District Nagpur

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. Lucky Udasi, Counsel for the applicant.
Mr. V. A. Thakre, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 22/07/2025

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.29/2025 registered with Police Station Narkhed, Nagpur, District Nagpur for the offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. Heard learned Counsel for the applicant, who submitted that the crime is registered on the basis of report lodged by the informant Sunil Ratnakar Kalbande on an allegation that the present applicant and other co-accused have obtained the food grains from him for trading and not paid him the amount. The cheque issued by the present applicant is also dishonoured and thus, he is duped by the

present applicant. He submitted that the FIR is rather late, after eight months and as far as the role of the present applicant is concerned, which is not specifically mentioned, his custodial interrogation is not required. In view of that, he be released on anticipatory bail.

3. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application on the ground that in all 20 offences are registered against the present applicant of the similar nature. The modus operandi of the present applicant is similar. All the victims in the above said crimes are the poor agriculturists whose amount is due from the present applicant. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

4. On hearing both sides and on perusal of the recitals of the FIR and investigation papers, it reveals that 20 offences are registered against the present applicant of the similar nature. From the recitals of the other FIR, it also reveals that same modus operandi was there. As far as the agriculturists are concerned to obtain the food grains from them, issue the cheque to them, the cheques are not honoured by the present applicant. Thus, considering the role attributed to the present applicant and the modus operandi of the present applicant, admittedly, his custodial interrogation is required. In view of that, the application deserves to

(3)

938.aba.506.2025

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

ORDER

The application is rejected.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)

Sarkate