



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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.627 OF 2025

Dhanraj s/o Shrikrushna Jamode

.Vs.

State of Maharashtra thr. PSO Telhara Dist. Akola and ors.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions Court's or Judge's orders.
and Registrar's Orders.

Mr. Nitin Vyawahare, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.A. Badar, APP for respondent No. 1 and 2/State.

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE AND

RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.

DATED : 06.11.2025.

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking to quash First Information Report lodged by respondent No.2. The First Information Report has been lodged on 22.05.2025 which came to be registered vide Crime No.0156/2025 for the offence punishable under Section 39 of the Maharashtra Money-Lending (Regulation) Act, 2014 (for short, 'the Act of 2014').

2. The argument is that one solitary transaction cannot be taken aid of to hold that the petitioner is involved in the business of money lending as defined under Section 2(3) of the Act of 2014. The First Information Report indicates that the petitioner has given money to the tune of Rs.4,85,000/- (Rupees Four Lacs and Eighty Five Thousand Only) at the rate of 3% per month.

3. Learned APP submits that it transpired in investigation that petitioner possessed 38 original sale deeds of different persons and 176 blank but signed stamps papers in the name of different persons indicating that the petitioner is involved in the business of money lending.

4. As such petitioner's argument is that he being stamp vendor, possessing stamp papers cannot be said to be an evidence to show that the petitioner is involved in money lending business. However, if the stamp papers are signed and are in different names and if the stamp papers are blank, coupled with recovery of 35 original sale-deeds from the possession of petitioner, then there is every reason to believe that the petitioner is involved in the business of money lending.

5. That being so, it will be too early to jump to the conclusion that the transaction mentioned in the First Information Report is the only transaction which the petitioner is involved into. This is not a stage, where we should interfere in the investigation particularly when petitioner has number of options available once the investigation is completed. The petitioner should cooperate in the investigation.

6. There is thus, no merit in the petition. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

[RAJ D. WAKODE, J]

[ANIL L. PANSARE, J.]