



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 745/2025

Ramesh s/o. Ramkrishna Navghare 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. Anil Mardikar, Sr. Advocate a/b. Mr. R. S. Kurekar, Advocate for
the Applicant.

Ms M. A. Barabde, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 17/12/2025.

. Heard.

2. The applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No.610 of 2025, registered with Police Station, Washim, District Washim for the offences punishable under Sections 471, 468, 467, 465 and 420 r/w 34 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The allegations are made that the applicant is running an institute and has given the assurance of the job and has taken the amount of Rs.7,31,000/-. The job was offered but, he was not asked for any work and for three to four days, his signatures were taken on the muster, but when he asked about it then, the person told him that he will give him another job and the allegations are made that after taking the amount, the job was not given to the applicant.

4. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the applicant has stated that the FIR is registered for recovery of amount. It cannot be granted. He stated that the complainant was given job. He joined the duty and, thereafter, he asked for refund of amount. The incident

took place in the year 2023 and thereafter, in 2025 he has lodged the complaint. There is delay. Hence, prayed to confirm the interim protection granted on 01.10.2025.

5. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that the applicant has forged the documents and given the appointment letter. Though the complainant went to join the duty, no work was given to him. Considering the forged documents and the forged stamp used of the Government, the custody of this applicant is required. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard both the learned Counsel for the respective parties.

7. On perusal of the record, it appears that the amount was given for giving the job. Job was given and the complainant joined the duty, however, no work was given. Thereafter, he had not gone to duty. After two years, he has lodged the complaint as his money was not returned.

8. Considering the allegations made against this applicant, the custodial interrogation of this applicant is not required. Besides there is delay in lodging the FIR. The interim protection granted on 01.10.2025 is confirmed on the same terms and conditions except a modification in the condition No.[iv] that the applicant shall attend the Police Station as and when required by the Investigating Officer. Rest of the conditions are kept as it is.

9. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)