



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

26 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLN. NO.1714 OF 2024

SAMBHAJI SITARAM BHALEKAR

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...

APP for Respondent-State : Mr.P.D.Patil

...

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.

DATE : 09.03.2026

P.C. :

1] None for the applicant.

2] The learned APP for the respondent-State submits that after obtaining ad-interim protection, the applicant has failed to co-operate with the investigation despite of the communication issued by the Investigating Officer. This Court, vide order dated 11.10.2024, had granted interim protection in favour of the applicant on the condition that the applicant shall attend the concerned police station once in a week and co-operate with the investigation. The applicant has failed to attend and co-operate with the investigation. Thereafter the matter was

listed on 30.09.2025. On that date submission was made by the learned APP that the applicant has failed to comply with the condition imposed while granting interim protection vide order dated 11.10.2024 and there is subsequent FIRs lodged against the applicant wherein the applicant is again absconding and is not co-operating in the subsequent FIR also filed under MPID Act. The said fact was noted in the order dated 30.09.2025 passed by this Court. However, by way of indulgence as a last chance, the applicant was directed to remain present before the Investigating Officer on 06.10.2025 at 1.00 p.m. pertaining to the present crime i.e. Crime No.245/2024.

3] The learned APP further submits that the applicant has failed to attend the police station or co-operate with the investigation even on 06.10.2025 at 1.00 p.m. as directed by this Court vide order dated 30.09.2025. The report to that effect along with station diary entry dated 06.10.2025 taken in the general diary No.032 is placed on record and marked as 'X' for identification.

4] Thus, taking into consideration continuous non compliance of the condition imposed by this Court vide order dated 11.10.2024 at the time of granting ad-interim protection to the applicant and also non compliance of the last order dated 30.09.2025. It appears that the applicant has no regards to the orders passed by this Court. The interim relief was granted in favour of the applicant on the condition that the applicant shall attend the concerned police station and co-operate with the investigation, however, the applicant has failed to attend the concerned Police Station after obtaining interim relief.

5] In so far as merits of the case is concerned, it appears that the applicant is directly involved in the present crime. The applicant is alleged to have acted mala fidely and dishonestly and committed financial fraud by misusing the documents of the loan files relating to the Raje Shivaji Gramin Bigar Sheti Pat Sanstha, Parner. The applicant was working as Chief Executive Officer of Raje Shivaji Gramin Bigar Sheti Pat Sanstha, Parner and is alleged to have

defrauded the concerned Department and misappropriated huge amount to the tune of Rs.6 crores along with other accused persons. The applicant, namely, Sambhaji Bhalekar, was working as Chief Executive Officer and has approved the loan applications of 12 borrowers and transferred the amounts from their accounts to the account of accused Popat Dhawale and the applicant in connivance with the other accused persons have cheated the investors, who are poor and illiterate person of the nearby areas.

6] The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy v. Central Bureau of Investigation**, (2013) 7 SCC 439 and in the case of **Tarunkumar Vs. Assistant Director Directorate of Enforcement**, 2023 NSC 1006, was pleased to hold that the economic offences constitute a class apart and need to be visited with a different approach in the matter of bail. The economic offences having deep-rooted conspiracies and involving huge loss of public funds need to be viewed seriously and considered as a grave offences affecting the economy of the

country as a whole and thereby posing serious threat to the financial health of the country.

7] The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Nimmagadda Prasad vs C.B.I., Hyderabad**, (2013) 7 SCC 466, has held as under :

23. Unfortunately, in the last few years, the country has been seeing an alarming rise in white-collar crimes, which has affected the fibre of the country's economic structure. Incontrovertibly, economic offences have serious repercussions on the development of the country as a whole. In *State of Gujarat v. Mohanlal Jitmalji Porwal* [(1987) 2 SCC 364 : 1987 SCC (Cri) 364] this Court, while considering a request of the prosecution for adducing additional evidence, inter alia, observed as under:

"5. ...The entire community is aggrieved if the economic offenders who ruin the economy of the State are not brought to book. A murder may be committed in the heat of moment upon passions being aroused.

An economic offence is committed with cool calculation and deliberate design with an eye on personal profit regardless of the consequence to the community. A disregard for the interest of the community can be manifested only at the cost of forfeiting the trust and faith of the community in the system to administer justice in an even-handed manner without fear of criticism from the quarters which view white-collar crimes with a permissive eye unmindful of the damage done to the national economy and national interest."

8] Thus, taking into consideration the allegations against the present applicant wherein the applicant is alleged to have been involved in huge misappropriation of

the public money, I am not inclined to entertain the present application. The applicant has also failed to comply with the conditions imposed by this Court vide order dated 11.10.2024. The applicant has also failed to comply with the last order dated 30.09.2025 vide which the applicant was given last chance to attend the investigation Officer and co-operate with the investigation.

9] Taking into consideration above facts, I am not inclined to entertain the present application for grant of anticipatory bail. The Anticipatory Bail Application is, therefore, rejected.

10] Needless to mention that the interim protection granted vide order dated 11.10.2024 stands vacated.

[MEHROZ K. PATHAN]
JUDGE

DDC