



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

APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 98 OF 2024

Ankush Mukesh Gupta

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

Mr. Atharva more h/f Mr. V. A. Bagdiya, Advocate for applicant

Mr. A. V. Lawate, APP for respondent No. 1-State

Ms. Sayali Tekale, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 and 3

CORAM : R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 12th JUNE, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard learned counsel for both sides.
2. This application is for cancellation of pre-arrest bail granted by the Additional Sessions Court, Jalna on 06.11.2019 in Criminal Bail Application No. 1004 of 2019 whereby pre-arrest bail came to be granted to the contesting respondents in connection with crime No. 606 of 2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 120-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Present application is filed on the ground that the offence is serious in nature and this is a case where the contesting respondents have allegedly cheated the applicant to the tune of Rs. 3 Crores. It is contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that considering the serious nature of the crime and in order to recover the amount, the custodial interrogation of the contesting respondents would be necessary.

4. Learned counsel for contesting respondents opposes the said contention. It is pointed out that the order in question was passed on 06.11.2019, and there is nothing on record to show that the conditions of the bail have been breached by the contesting respondents. It is also pointed out that the charge has already been framed before the Trial Court and, as such, there is no merit in the application.

5. Record indicates that the learned Additional Sessions Judge while passing impugned order dated 06.11.2019, has rightly taken into consideration all facts and circumstances of the case and recorded appropriate findings in Paragraph No. 9 of the said order. The order has been passed as back as in November, 2019 and there is nothing to show that the conditions of the bail have been breached by the contesting respondents imposed by the Sessions Court. Moreover, since charge is framed and trial would get commenced, this Court finds no reason for cancellation of bail.

6. Application stands rejected.

7. The Fees of the learned appointed counsel is quantified at Rs. 10,000/-

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)

B. S. Joshi