



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 648/2025

Mr. Santosh Rustamrao Ingale

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. A. M. Jaltare, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. V.A. Thakare, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 15/09/2025.

. Heard.

2. The applicant has apprehension of arrest in Crime No.606/2025 registered at Police Station, Risod, District Washim for the offences punishable under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that there is agreement between the husband of the first informant and the applicant about the agreement to sale and at the same time, the possession was given as per the agreement. The husband of the first informant has given Rs.50,000/- in the year 2016.

4. The allegations made against this applicant are that he has subsequently sold the property to third person and sale-deed is executed and the said third person is in possession of the said property.

5. The learned Counsel for the applicant has stated that the dispute is of civil nature. Only because the first informant is police constable, she has lodged the complaint. The applicant is protected by granting ad-interim anticipatory bail and he is attending the police

station regularly. The applicant is Advocate by profession. Considering the nature of dispute, prayed to protect him by granting anticipatory bail.

6. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that the agreement itself shows that it is the agreement for possession and the entire amount was given at that time. The applicant has duped the first informant. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

7. Heard both the learned Counsel for the parties.

8. On the basis of document i.e. Agreement to Sale, the crime is registered. It appears from the said document that the dispute is of civil nature. As the custodial interrogation of this applicant is not required, the interim protection granted by this Court is confirmed.

9. The application is allowed on the same terms and conditions contained in the order granting interim protection.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)