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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.531 OF 2025

(Ganpat Latari Dhande 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. U.M. Changle, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. N.B. Jawade, APP for the State.

CORAM:- URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED :- AUGUST 05, 2025.

Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.57/2025 registered with Police Station Rajura, District Chandrapur for the offence punishable under Sections 171, 409, 420, 465, 466, 468, 471, 472, 473 and 477-A 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 Devendra Dukre who took a charge of the post of Manager in the year 2022 and it revealed to him that prior to 2021 co-accused Bhupendra Hanumate was working as Manager since 22.03.2012 to 21.01.2022. The co-accused Bhupendra Hanumante being the Manager was having the responsibility of loan department and pre-sanction procedure in cases of loan application. After the complainant took charge he found certain irregularities in the loan applications. The documents of title which were

kept as a mortgage were a forged and bogus document and the loan was disbursed on the basis of the said forged document to the extent of Rs.55,00,000/-. On the basis of the said report, police have registered the crime.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that the loans are not obtained by the present applicant, he stood as a witness. The main accused against whom the allegation of misappropriation is there is already released on bail. As far as the custodial interrogation is concerned which is not required and the entire investigation revolves around the documentary evidence. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the application and submitted that the involvement of the present applicant in an economic offence. He as well as his wife has obtained the loan on the basis of the forged documents. The custodial interrogation of the applicant is required as to ascertain who are the other persons involved in the said forgery. Moreover, public money is involved in the said transaction. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. On hearing both the sides and on perusal of the investigation papers it reveals that the co-accused with the help of the present applicant shown that the amount of the loan was disbursed in the name of the present applicant and his wife. There is another crime registered

against the present applicant also and the other co-accused. The investigation papers further reveals that on the basis of the forged documents, the said loan was obtained. Admittedly, the amount which was used in disbursing the loan amount is a public money. The statements of the witnesses and the audit report also shows that on the basis of the forged documents the loan amount are disbursed. Thus, considering the role attributed to the present applicant and his involvement in an economic offence, the public money is used in disbursing the loan amount. The loans are obtained on the basis of the forged documents, and therefore, the custodial interrogation of the present applicant is required. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

6. Hence, the application is rejected accordingly.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)

**Divya*