

Shubhada S Kadam

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO.3917 OF 2025**

Hemraj Chintaman Thakur

versus

The State of Maharashtra

Ms. Manvi Sharma i/b. Mr. Saurabh Butala, Advocate for Applicant.
Mr. B. B.Kulkarni, APP for Respondent-State.
API-Balvant Patil, Khandeshwar Police Station, present.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 9th MARCH, 2026.

P.C. :

1. By this application, the applicant is seeking regular bail in Crime No. 68 of 2022 registered with Khandeshwar Police Station, District Raigad, for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 406 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code 1860.

2. It is prosecution's case that the applicant and co-accused lured the first informant and other investors stating that they would give them flats under the redevelopment scheme of CIDCO. It is alleged that they prepared false letterheads of CIDCO and fake stamps to lure the first informant and investors and took lakhs of rupees from them and cheated them.

3. It is contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that the

**SHUBHADA
SHANKAR
KADAM**

Digitally signed by
SHUBHADA
SHANKAR KADAM
Date: 2026.03.12
10:36:43 +0530

Shubhada S Kadam

main allegations are against accused No.1. The applicant is behind bars for more than 16 months. Investigation is completed and charge sheet has been filed. There is no progress in the trial and requested to allow the application.

4. It is contention of learned APP that the applicant was acting as an agent. He induced the first informant and other investors to invest money. He and the co-accused prepared false letterheads of CIDCO and fake stamps and used them at various places. The fraud amount of ₹4,13,000 was received in the bank account of the applicant. It shows his active involvement in the crime. The applicant has antecedents of the same nature. If he is released on bail, he may abscond or threaten the prosecution witnesses. Hence, requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel, perused charge sheet and documents produced on record. The statements of witnesses are produced on record. It appears from the record that the applicant and co-accused induced the investors by promising to provide flats under the CIDCO scheme. It also appears that the applicant and co-accused prepared false letterheads of the CIDCO office and fake stamps. The fraud amount of more than ₹4 lakhs was transferred to the bank account of the applicant. It shows his involvement in the crime. Considering these facts, I am not inclined to allow the application. Hence, I pass the following order.

Shubhada S Kadam

ORDER

- (i) The application stands rejected.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)