



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 710/2025

Hrutik s/o. Balu Chavhan Vs. The 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. Nilesh Tikar, Advocate h/f. Mr. D. N. Mudgale, Advocate for the
Applicant.

Mr. A. J. Gohokar, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 17/10/2025.

1. Heard.
2. The applicant is apprehending arrest in Crime No.139/2025 for the offence punishable under Sections 316(5) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. The applicant, was the Recovery Agent in Darwha Collection Center. The allegations are made that the applicant along with Manager has misappropriated an amount of Rs.2,43,860/-. It is alleged that the amount, which was recovered from the persons who have taken loan, is not deposited by the applicant in the bank and, therefore, the offence is registered.
4. The learned Advocate for the applicant has stated that the applicant is no more Agent of the bank. He has resigned on 01.07.2024. The Manager, who is the responsible person, is protected by granting ad interim anticipatory bail by this Court. Hence the ground of parity is available to the applicant. He has prayed to protect the applicant by granting ad interim anticipatory bail.
5. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that while granting bail to the Manager, the Court has observed that, the role of the Agent is prime. The

applicant is the Agent. He has transferred the amount in the account of his relatives. During enquiry of the bank staff, he was on duty. The applicant has returned the amount of Rs.44,600/-. The applicant has played an active role in this case. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard the learned Counsel for the respective parties.

7. As the applicant has paid the amount and there are number of Agents in this case who have committed this fraud, the other co-accused are already released on bail, this applicant is protected by granting ad interim anticipatory bail. The learned A.P.P. conceded that the applicant is attending the Police Station.

8. Considering the role played by this applicant and as he has paid some of the amount, the custodial interrogation of this applicant is not required. Hence, the interim protection granted on 19.09.2025 is confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

9. The application stands disposed of.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)