



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION(ABA) NO.819 OF 2025

Gautam Prakash Gedam Vs. State of Maharashtra

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr. A.A.Dhawas,counsel for the applicant.
Mr.Ashish Kadukar, APP for the State.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 28/11/2025

1. The applicant has apprehension of arrest in Crime No.0024/2025 registered with Cyber Police station Nagpur City, for the offences punishable under Section 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(1), 340(2), of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023; and Section 66(c) of the Information Technology Act. 2000.

2. It is the case of prosecution that, on 12.03.2025 a complaint was registered by one Ravindra Gyaneshwar Patil who was working as Administrative Officer with the Deputy Director of Education Nagpur contending that since June 2024 complaints were received by their office regarding bogus appointment being made in aided schools and causing loss to the government. During inquiry conducted by various authorities, it was found that there were huge irregularities in respect of grant of Shalarth IDs. The names

of the employees were included in the said scheme in spite of there being no orders from the Office of Deputy Director of Education. In the said complaint, it was also stated that the present applicant i.e. Superintendent Pay and Provident Fund Unit was responsible for forwarding the salary bills of the concerned employees without verification. Therefore, a detailed complaint was lodged and first information report came to be registered. The name of this applicant was not mentioned in the FIR. Now the charge-sheet is filed.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant has made a submission that one of the person from RTI has lodged a complaint. Notices were issued to this applicant and he has attended the police station and co-operated with the police. He has acted as a witness. Now the charge-sheet is filed. One Mr. Bhagole was appointed and the applicant was incharge Superintendent at that time for four months during Covid-19 period. As per the allegations 40 IDs are shown in front of his name. Mr.Bhagole is arrested and he is released on bail. Now the charge-sheet is filed. The custodial interrogation of this applicant is not required hence prayed to allow the application.

4. The learned APP has opposed the application stating that none of the accused was granted the anticipatory bail. This Court has passed the detailed order and rejected the application. One of the applicant who is Superintendent and is also holding charge and his application was rejected

by this Court. The custodial interrogation of this applicant is necessary as he had played active role. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

5. Heard both the sides and perused the record.

6. It appears from the record that the applicant has attended the police station, whenever the police called during the investigation. Whenever he had received the notice he attended the police station. It is also reflected in the order passed by this Court 31/10/2025. The notice was issued to this applicant that his involvement is transpired during the investigation and therefore, he has filed this application. Considering the period for which he was in-charge Superintendent and it was Covid period, Mr.Bhagole, who has created those IDs was taken in custody and released on bail. Considering the period of this applicant and as the charge-sheet is filed, the investigation is completed, the other co-accused against whom the allegations were made, are taken into custody and released on bail. The custodial interrogation of this applicant is not required. Hence the application is allowed. Accordingly, I pass following order:

i] It is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant Gautam Prakash Gedam, in connection with Crime No.24/2025 registered with Cyber Police station Nagpur City, for the offences punishable under Section 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(1), 340(2), of the Bhartiya Nyaya

Sanhita 2023; and Section 66(c) of the Information Technology Act. 2000 he be released on bail on furnishing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rupees Twenty Thousand each with one solvent surety in the like amount.

ii] The applicant shall not in any way tamper with the prosecution evidence.

iii] The applicant shall not pressurize or threaten the prosecution witnesses.

iv] The applicant shall attend the concerned police station on every Monday and Saturday between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.

v] The applicant shall co-operate the investigation officer.

The application stands disposed of.

JUDGE