



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION(ABA) NO.954 OF 2025

Rameshwar Ramesh Petle 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.S.V.Sirpurkar, counsel for the applicant.
Mr. Vinod Thakare,APP for the State.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 18/12/2025

1. Heard.
2. Issue notice to the non-applicant, returnable on
08/01/2026.
3. Learned APP waives service of notice for non-
applicant/State.
4. The applicant has apprehension of arrest in
connection with Crime No.961 of 2025, registered with
Police Station Gadge Nagar, Amravati for the offences
punishable under Sections 303(2),61(2),318(4) and 309(4)
of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
5. It is the case of the prosecution that the applicant
and the complainant were acquainted with each other. The
accused represented to the complainant that he had contacts
with customs department, who were selling seized gold at a
lower price and persuaded him to travel to Mumbai for the

transaction. The complainant, along with his friend Rajendra Ahuja, travelled with the accused to Mumbai on 17/04/2025. Meetings were arranged with a purported Customs officer at Nashik on 19/04/2025, where gold samples were shown. Thereafter, the complainant arranged ₹35,00,000/- and, on the accused's assurance, deposited the amount for the proposed transaction scheduled on 24/04/2025. However, the transaction did not materialise. On 25/04/2025, at the instance of the said officer, they met near Hiranandani Hospital, Powai. After viewing further samples and being dissatisfied, they left. The cash bag containing 35,00,000/- was kept in the trunk of a taxi arranged by the accused. During the journey from Powai to Kalyan, the taxi allegedly left with the cash when the complainant and his friend got down, resulting in loss of the money. Subsequently, it is alleged that the complainant and the accused also went to Delhi, where ₹17,00,000/- was exchanged with an unknown person for gold, instead an English dictionary was delivered. Thereafter, on the suggestion of the police officer, complainant lodged the FIR.

6. The learned counsel for the applicant has stated that though the first incident occurred on 17.04.2025 and second incident occurred on 21.06.2025, the crime is registered on 11.11.2025. The complaint was lodged in Amravati though the incident took place in Mumbai and Delhi. The applicant has stated that the improbable story is narrated by the

complainant as there is delay and no role is played by this applicant. The allegations are only that he had introduced the officer and the allegations about theft are against taxi driver. The custodial interrogation of this applicant is not necessary. Hence, prayed to protect him by granting ad interim anticipatory bail.

7. The learned APP has opposed the application stating that he is the person, who has introduced the officer. The taxi driver, was also known to this applicant. He is the main person. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

8. Heard both the sides and perused the record.

9. Considering the belated FIR lodged by the complainant i.e. after near about four months, two incidents are occurred even after the first incident he believed in the words of this applicant and had transaction with him and again he was duped for Rs.17,00,000/- and thereafter, the complaint was lodged. Considering the allegations made against this applicant, the case is made out to protect the applicant by granting ad-interim anticipatory bail. Accordingly, I pass following order:

i] By way of *ad-interim* protection, it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant-Rameshwar Ramesh Petle in connection with Crime No. crime No.961 of 2025, registered with Police Station Gadge Nagar, Amravati for the offence punishable under Sections 303(2),61(2),318(4) and

309(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 he be released on bail on furnishing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rupees Twenty Thousand 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.

10. The protection shall remain in force till next date.

JUDGE