



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 337 OF 2025

(Sanjay Vasant Rao Dorlikar

Vs.

State of Maharashtra, Thr. PSO, PS Sadar, Tah. & Dist. Nagpur.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Mr. H.D. Dangre, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. D.V. Chauhan, PP a/w Mr. A.A. Madiwale, APP for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM: URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.

DATED : 14th AUGUST, 2025

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of Police in connection with Crime No.254/2025 registered with Sadar Police Station, Nagpur for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 472, 409, 120-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, the Applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. Heard learned Counsel for the Applicant who submitted that, the Applicant was serving as an Education Officer. The allegation against him is that he has granted the approval by making exception to the case of Parag Nanaji Pudke serving in Nanaji Pudke Vidyalaya, Jevtala, Tahsil Lakhani, District Bhandara. He submitted that, as far as the custodial interrogation of the present Applicant is concerned which is not required as the present Applicant has already cooperated with the Investigating Agency. He also invited my attention towards the fact that in all 51 cases are considered

by the present Applicant during his tenure and the chart which is filed on record by the prosecution shows only 11 cases while the period taken was 15 days to 3 days. He submitted that the other cases are not intentionally shown by the prosecution which shows that in various matters the Applicant has granted approvals on one day.

3. He further invited my attention towards the Government Resolution dated 06.02.2012. In view of the said Government Resolution it was the duty of the Headmaster to fill up the information and not by the Education Officer. He submitted that, in view of that the experience certificates have to be scrutinized by the Management which was not done. The approval was initially granted to the present Applicant which is only extended by the present Applicant. He submitted that even the allegation against the present Applicant is not that he was the part of the conspiracy and in perusal of the said conspiracy he has accepted the experience certificate knowingly it was forged and thereafter granted approval.

4. Thus, he submitted that even accepting the allegation as it is, at the most it can be said that he has granted the approval but as far as the knowledge of the forged document is concerned, nothing is on record to show that the Applicant was having knowledge of the forged document. In view of that, the custodial interrogation of the present Applicant is not required, and therefore, the *ad interim* protection granted to the present Applicant deserves to be confirmed.

5. Learned P.P. strongly opposed the said Application and submitted that during investigation the involvement of the present Applicant is not only revealed in granting the approval but also receiving the pecuniary gain. He invited my attention towards the order passed by this Court in Criminal Application (ABA) No. 360/2025, wherein this Court has pertinently observed that the Applicant had received a sum of Rs. 8 Lakhs from the accused no.1 for himself and for Education Officer Sanjay Dorlikar i.e. the present Applicant in order to clear the proposal. He further submitted that, the order of this Court is also confirmed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Special Leave Petition No. 9230/2025, wherein in para 3 it is specifically observed that there is a specific allegation against the Petitioner of not only being a part of the conspiracy but also having accepted a sum of Rs. 8 Lakhs for the fraudulent activities and in view of that the Application was rejected. He submitted that considering this aspect, the custodial interrogation of the present Applicant is required, and therefore, the Application deserves to be rejected.

6. On hearing both the sides and on perusal of the investigation papers and the statements of the witnesses, as far as the approval is concerned the statements of the witnesses disclose the role of the present Applicant. The experience certificate dated 31.12.2022 is found to be a bogus and fake document. The Office bearers of the said Society have denied issuance of any such certificate. It is also revealed that the co-accused does not have any experience of working on the post of the Assistant Teacher and was as such not

eligible for the appointment to the post of Head Master. Nonetheless, the proposal for approval to his appointment was cleared within a period of one day. It was received on 19.07.2023 and was cleared on 21.07.2023. It appears from the documents produced by the prosecution for perusal of this Court that as per the co-accused the present Applicant and other co-accused have received a sum of Rs. 8 Lakhs for grant of the said approval and to clear the said proposal. The undue haste in which the matter is proposed by itself indicates some foul play in the matter. Thus, considering the statements of the witnesses and the fact that this aspect was considered by this Court in the Criminal Application (ABA) No. 360/2025 and rejected the Application of the co-accused. At the same time, the Hon'ble Apex Court has also considered this fact and rejected the Application of the co-accused. Similar allegation is levelled against the present Applicant also. In view of that, the present Application deserves to be rejected. Accordingly, I proceed to pass following order:

ORDER

i. The Application is **rejected**.

7. Pending application/s, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)