



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

970 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 252 OF 2026 WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 677 OF 2026
IN BA/252/2026

Pandurang Parasram JadhavApplicant

VERSUS

The State of MaharashtraRespondent

Mr. A. K. Bhosle, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. B. B. Bhise, APP for the State.

Mr. A. S. Shelke, Advocate for the informant.

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 24th FEBRUARY, 2026.

PER COURT :

1. Learned Counsel Mr. Shelke seeks permission to assist the learned APP.
2. Permission granted. Criminal Application No. 677/2026 stands allowed.
3. Applicant seeks regular bail in connection with Crime No. 0227/2025 registered with Himayatnagar Police Station, Dist. Nanded for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 470, 471 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. The case of prosecution is that the Applicant represented himself as a consultant of Sewadas Solar Project Private Limited and gained confidence of informant and his friends for investing in the Solar Project. They acted as per the instructions of the Applicant and invested huge amount in the project and paid consultancy charges to the Applicant. The Applicant assured the informant and others for getting foreign funds without mortgage of any property for their project. Further, he assured them that their project will be sold out.

On 17.01.2022, Applicant introduced the informant and his friends to Mr. R. B. Singh, who agreed to take over informant's project by issuing cheque of Rs. 5,00,000/- with a condition not to get it honoured till PPA is finalised. the Applicant further assured the informant that he will repay the amount however, he threatened the informant and avoided to respond informant's communication. On this backdrop, First Information Report came to be lodged.

5. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is falsely implicated in the crime. Allegations in the First Information Report are vague and baseless. The role of the Applicant was that of a consultant of the company and as such has no concern with the

alleged fraud. The Applicant only rendered services to the informant as Consultant and since the agreement could not be materialised, informant lodged false complaint against the Applicant. It is further submitted that there is unexplained delay in lodging First Information Report. Investigation in the crime is complete and charge-sheet is filed. Applicant who is 65 years old is arrested on 25.09.2025. Hence, considering the age of the Applicant, prayed to enlarge the Applicant on bail.

6. Per contra, learned APP and learned Counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the application submitting that the Applicant is involved in serious crime. It is submitted that the Applicant represented himself to be the consultant of a firm which was not in existence. Thus, the motive of the Applicant to deceive at inception is evident. Further, the hard earned money of the informant and others is mis-appropriated. An apprehension is also expressed by learned Counsel for the informant that if the Applicant is enlarged on bail, there is every possibility of tampering prosecution evidence. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

7. Upon considering submissions of both sides and on perusal of the record, including charge-sheet, indicates that the primary allegation levelled against the Applicant is inducing the informant and others to invest in the project in the year 2022, whereas the complaint is with an unexplained delay. It is pertinent to note that the investigation in the crime is based on documentary and since all the documents are already seized, further incarceration of the Applicant is not warranted.

8. Nevertheless, investigation in the crime is complete for all purpose and intent. Resultantly, charge-sheet is filed. Applicant is behind the bars since 25.09.2025. Having regard to the number of witnesses prosecution intends to examine, the trial is not likely to be concluded within a reasonable period. Nothing is to be recovered at the instance of the Applicant. Having regard to the aforestated circumstances and the age of the Applicant, I am inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the Applicant. The apprehension expressed by learned Counsel for the informant can be adequately taken care of by imposing stringent conditions.

9. Hence, the following order :-

ORDER

- (i) Application is allowed.
- (ii) Applicant Pandurang Parasram Jadhav, be released on bail, on furnishing P.R. bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rs. Fifty Thousand) with one or two local solvent sureties, in the like amount, in connection with Crime No. 0227/2025 registered with Himayatnagar Police Station, Dist. Nanded for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 470, 471 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code., on the following conditions :-

- (a) The Applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the prosecution evidence, in any manner.
- (b) The Applicant shall attend the trial on each and every date unless exempted by the Trial Court and shall not leave the area of jurisdiction of the concerned Police Station till conclusion of the trial.
- (c) The Applicant shall submit Aadhar and Pan Cards to the Investigating Officer and detailed address and phone numbers of the Applicant and two of the near relatives.
- (d) In case of breach of any of the conditions by the Applicant, it is open for the prosecution to move concerned Court seeking cancellation of bail.

- (iii) Needless to state that, nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on merits of the case. Learned Trial court shall proceed independently and uninfluenced by the observations made hereinabove.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)