



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

BAIL APPLICATION NO.201 OF 2026

Shaligram s/o Subhash Yeolekar,
Age: 40 years, Occ. Private Service,
R/o. Yogeswar Colony, Near Shrikrushna
Mandir, Deopur, Dhule, Tq. & Dist. Dhule
Present residing near Power House,
Kingaon, Dist. Latur.

..Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra,
Through Police Inspector,
Deopur Police Station,
Dhule, Tq. & Dist. Dhule.

..Respondent

...

Mr. D.M. Shinde h/f Mr. S.B. Madde, Advocate for the Applicant.
Mr. A.R. Kale, APP for Respondent-State.

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

DATED : MARCH 05, 2026.

FINAL ORDER:-

1. The applicant seeks regular bail in connection with Crime No.121/2023 registered with Deopur Police Station, Dist. Dhule for the offence punishable under Sections 409 and 420 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The investigation was set in motion on the basis of information given by Ravindra Vasantrao Khankari, Chairman of Shriram Nagari Sahakari Patsanstha, Deopur. In nutshell, it is alleged that applicant was employed with credit society since 2000. He was assigned duty of accounts and operation of strong room wherein gold pledged with credit society was preserved. He used to hold keys of

locker.

3. Since 09.09.2022, applicant was absent from duties without leave or intimation. His cell phone was off. On 30.09.2022, notices were issued on his address to remain present on duty. The employees of society visited house of applicant but he could not be located. Lastly, employees and directors of credit society opened locker under video shooting and found that pledged gold and other ornaments were missing. It is accordingly alleged that applicant/accused committed offence punishable under Section 409 and 420 of Indian Penal Code.

4. The investigation progressed and charge sheet has been filed against applicant. The applicant came to be arrested on 04.12.2025. He was absconding for a period of more than two and half years. The applicant moved Sessions Court for grant of regular bail vide Criminal Bail Application No.1206 of 2025, which came to be rejected vide order dated 23.12.2025. Hence, this application.

5. Mr. D.M. Shinde, learned advocate appearing for applicant submits that applicant has been victimized because of dispute with directors of society. He had left the job, however, he has been falsely implicated. Mr. Shinde would submit that there is nothing to show that applicant was entrusted with property of credit society or he was incharge of strong room or its operation. Nothing could be recovered from applicant during course of investigation. Further detention of

applicant would not be necessary, as investigation is over and trial is likely to take its own course.

6. Per contra, Mr. Kale, learned APP strongly opposed the application.

7. The averments in FIR clearly states that applicant was incharge of strong room and locker. He was holding keys of strong room. Suddenly from 09.09.2022, he absconded from duties. Despite private and public notice and search by co-employees, he could not be traced. In this backdrop, the locker/strong room was opened which revealed that gold ornaments worth 289 grams were missing. The charge sheet contains office order dated 31.05.2019 issued by Assistant Manager of Credit Society whereby applicant was appointed as incharge of strong room. The office order is signed by applicant. The statement of witnesses depicts that applicant was discharging his role on the basis of aforesaid office order.

8. The applicant suddenly stopped attending office since 09.09.2022 and came to be arrested only on 04.12.2025. The conduct of applicant supports case of prosecution. *Prima facie* on consideration of averments in FIR and material in charge sheet, triable case for commission of offence by applicant is made out. The offence under Section 409 of Indian Penal Code provides for punishment upto life imprisonment in case of criminal breach of trust by public servant or banker.

9. Looking to gravity of offence and fact that applicant could be arrested after two and half years from date of registration of offence, release of applicant would hamper further progress of trial. In result, no case is made out for grant of bail. Hence, application stands rejected.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

Mujaheed//