



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 582/2025

Shri Mandar s/o. Rajabhau Deshmukh Vs. State of Maharashtra

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. R. D. Bhuibhar, Advocate for the Applicant.
 Mr. A. J. Gohokar, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant(s)/State.
 Mr. P. V. Navlani, Advocate assist to prosecution.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 23/09/2025.

. The applicant has apprehension of arrest in Crime No.687/2025 registered at Police Station Yavatmal City, District Yavatmal for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3) and 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the applicant is Branch Manager in Shri Renuka Mata Multi- State Co-operative Urban Credit Society Limited, Ahilya Nagar, Yavatmal. The allegation about misappropriation of Rs.1,63,281/- are made against this applicant by one Arvind Pachkavade, account holder. It is alleged that the said account holder as against the F.D.R. of Rs.2,00,000/- had sought loan of Rs.1.60 lakhs and was ready to close his loan case by paying an amount of Rs.1,63,281/-, however, the applicant as per the said report had instructed the said account holder to give the bearer cheque of the said amount in the name of the applicant and had accordingly encashed the said cheque, which had caused wrongful loss to the said Society and the loan case of the said account holder also could not be closed.

3. The learned Counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant is protected by this Court by granting *ad interim* anticipatory bail. Hence, prayed to confirm the anticipatory bail granted on 06.08.2025.

4. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that the applicant has duped several persons. The fraud is approximately or Rs.50,00,000/-. He has forged the signatures of some depositors. He has created forged pass book and started Recurring Deposits. The custodial interrogation of this applicant is necessary. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

5. The learned Counsel for the Bank has also opposed the application stating that several persons are duped. The statement of said persons are recorded. Though they have not lodged complaint, their statements are recorded. Hence, the custodial interrogation of this applicant is necessary.

6. Heard the learned Counsel for the respective parties.

7. The applicant has knowingly advised the depositors to give the bearer cheque and he has misappropriated the amount of Rs.1,63,281/- by depositing it in his own account. On perusal of the statements of the witnesses it appears that, he has duped many persons not just one. He has forged the documents. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of this applicant is necessary.

8. Hence, the application is rejected.

9. The interim protection granted earlier stands vacated.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)