



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 855/2025

Ashwin Shamdas Ambade Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr.

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. A. S. Band, Advocate for the Applicant.
Mr. V. A. Thakare, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 15/12/2025.

. Heard.

2. The applicant has apprehension of arrested in Crime No.268/2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that, one Madhuri Thakare has taken a loan from Kotak Mahendra Bank on 28.07.2023 of Rs.6,05,791/- on the basis of Pay Slip and Identity Card of Primary Health Center, Takalghat, District Nagpur. She has produced the said documents and on the basis of said documents, the loan was sanctioned. During enquiry, it was found that the documents, which were filed by the accused No.1 – Madhuri Thakare were forged and on the basis of the forged documents, she had obtained the loan.

4. The learned Counsel for the applicant has stated that the accused No.1 – Madhuri Thakare has refund the amount of Rs.95,075/- and the bank has to recover the amount of Rs.5,10,716/-, as the monthly EMI was not paid of the accused No.1 – Madhuri Thakare, bank employee visited the house and office of Madhuri Thakare. At that

time, she came to know that she is not working with the Primary Health Center, Takalghat and forged documents were filed. As she was protected and asked to attend the Police Station, during enquiry, she has disclosed the name of this applicant that he has given said documents after taking her original Aadhar Card and bank passbook and gave the documents after receiving 35% of amount of loan.

5. The learned Counsel for the applicant has stated that the accused No.1 has taken the photograph at Takalghat Primary Health Center by putting the Identity Card and produce it. The applicant has only forged the documents. The role is similar. The custodial interrogation of this applicant is not required. Hence, prayed to protect him by granting anticipatory bail.

6. The learned A.P.P. has opposed the application stating that the applicant has taken the amount from the accused No.1 and created documents. On the basis of the said forged documents, she has obtained the loan. The role of this applicant is main role and, therefore, the custody of this applicant is necessary. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

7. Heard the learned Counsel for the applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the state.

8. Accused No.1 – Madhuri Thakare has obtained loan with the help of this applicant. She has disclosed the name of this applicant that he has created the documents. The Salary Slip and the Identity Card of the Primary Health Center is forged by this applicant. He has taken some amount for creating said documents.

9. Considering the nature of the offence, the custody of this applicant is necessary. Hence, the application is rejected.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)