vai

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

VASANT ANANDRAO IDHOL

Digitally signed by VASANT ANANDRAO IDHOL
Date: 2026.10.09 20:16:31 +0530

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.871 OF 2026

Chandramani Deoraj Dubey ...Applicant
V/s.
State of Maharashtra & Anr. ..Respondents

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1311 OF 2026
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.871 OF 2026

Asad Salim Shaikh ...Intervener

IN THE MATTER OF:

Chandramani Deoraj Dubey ...Applicant
V/s.
State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr.Darshan Patankar with Mr.M.P. Mishra, and Mr.R.C. Mishra for the Applicant.

Mr.Karan Desai i/b Mr.Naman Rawal for the Intervenor.

Mr.Prasanna P. Malshe, APP for the Respondent – State.

Mr.Dada Gaikwad, PI, Property Cell, Crime Branch, Mumbai is present in Court.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.
DATE : 7th OCTOBER , 2026.

P.C. :-

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as learned

APP for the respondent-State.

2. The applicant is apprehending arrest in Crime No.653 of 2025 registered with Kasturba Marg Police Station for the offence punishable under Sections 3(5), 318(2), 318(4), 319(2), 322, 335, 336(2), 336(3), 337, 338, 340(2), 341(1), 341(2), 341(3) and 341(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

3. The allegations in FIR are that the accused persons named therein, had cheated the complainant by forging an Irrevocable Power of Attorney document (No. 4665/2010) using counterfeited government stamps, emblems, and signatures to falsely simulate its execution at the Borivali Joint Deputy Registrar's office and generate fake revenue receipts and thus even deceived the government authorities

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that although allegations have been made against the applicant, he has not been named in the FIR and no role is attributed to him. It is submitted that the applicant, despite being a Director of M/s. Pooja Land & Premises Pvt. Ltd., had no role in the alleged transactions, which were executed entirely by the other directors of the company. Furthermore, the applicant is not a signatory to any of the documents mentioned in the FIR. He further submits that five other co-accused have already been

granted regular bail by the Sessions Court. Notably, the investigation is complete and the charge-sheet has been filed, wherein the applicant has not been arraigned as an accused but has been placed under the category of a 'non-charge-sheeted person'. Additionally, in accordance with the interim protection order dated 01.07.2026 passed by this court, the applicant has fully cooperated with the investigation, having reported to the concerned police station on 15 separate dates as required by the Investigating Agency.

5. Learned APP for the respondent –State and learned counsel for the intervener submits that the offence is serious in nature and the custody of the applicant is required for securing all the relevant documents and thus oppose the application. However, the learned APP does not dispute the factual position that the applicant has attended the concerned police station on 15 separate dates and further that the charge-sheet is filed

6. Perused the FIR and the documents placed on record. It is applicant's contention that all the alleged transactions were executed by the other directors and it has to be noted that the applicant is not a signatory to any of the documents mentioned in the FIR. Pertinently, the applicant is a director of a company which had entered into certain transactions based on the document of irrevocable power of attorney. The said transaction was

made by other director. As such, only because this applicant happens to be director, he cannot be presumed to have intentionally done any transaction. Furthermore, since the charge-sheet has already been filed and the applicant has not been arraigned as an accused and in fact, has been placed under the category of a 'non-charge-sheeted person', his custodial interrogation need not be insisted. Given the fact that he has fully cooperated with the investigation by attending the police station on 15 separate dates and supplying all demanded documents, as the investigation relies entirely on documentary evidence, custodial interrogation of the applicant is not warranted. Hence, the interim protection granted on 1st July, 2026 by this Court needs to be confirmed.

7. Hence, I pass the following order:

: ORDER :

i] Anticipatory Bail Application is allowed.

ii] in the event of arrest of the applicant in crime no.653 of 2025 registered with kasturba marg police station for the offence punishable under sections 3(5), 318(2), 318(4), 319(2), 322, 335, 336(2), 336(3), 337, 338, 340(2), 341(1), 341(2), 341(3)

and 341(4) of bharatiya nyaya sanhita, 2023 (bns). He be released on bail on furnishing P. R. Bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with one solvent surety of the like amount.

iii] the applicant is directed to attend the police station as and when called by the investigating agency and produce all the relevant documents if demanded by the investigating agency.

8. The Anticipatory Bail Application is allowed and disposed of.

9. Interim Application no. 1311/2026, for intervention is also disposed of.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)