



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION(ABA) NO. 887 OF 2025

Ashwjit Punaji Wasnik Vs. The 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.M.Gedam,counsel for the applicant.
Ms.Mrunal Barabde, APP for the State.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 15/12/2025

1. The applicant has filed the present application for anticipatory bail, apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 0138/2025, registered with Police Station Beltrodi, Dist. Nagpur Sections 420 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (for short, "IPC").

2. The case of the prosecution is that the informant lodged the report on 10.03.2025 alleging therein that her husband had purchased the plot bearing No.4 ad-measuring 1500 sq.mtr in Khasra No.22/1, situated in Panchtara Gruh Nirman Sahakari Sanshtha, Nagpur and the accused nos. 4 and 5 stood as a witness to the said transaction. In the year 2020, someone erected the cement wall over the said plot. After the inquiry, she came to know that the sale-deed which was executed by the accused persons in favour of husband of

the informant was fake and bogus. Therefore, she lodged the report against all the accused persons who were involved in selling the aforesaid plot to several persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant was a bona fide purchaser who had purchased the plot from the accused no.2. Accused no.2 had purchased the plot from the accused no.1 and he had no knowledge that earlier owners were not real owners of the property. He further submits that dispute is of civil nature. According to him, the applicant is not involved in any of the alleged selling by executing fake selling.

4. The learned APP has opposed the application stating that on the bogus stamp, he has registered the sale deed. On perusal of the record, it appears that the earlier transactions were bogus. The applicant has purchased it from the accused no.2 and accused no.2 has purchased it from accused no.1. Considering the transactions between the parties and as the applicant has attended the police station regularly, the custodial interrogation of this applicant is not required. The interim protection granted on 21.11.2025 needs to be confirmed on the same terms and conditions except condition No. (II).

Hence, the following order-

i] The application is allowed.

ii] The order dated 21.11.225 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail is confirmed.

iii] The applicant shall attend the concerned police station as and when called by the investigating officer.

iv] The application stands disposed of.

JUDGE