

N.S.Kamble

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 4638 OF 2025

Anil Shankar Dabhole

... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

**NILAM
SANTOSH
KAMBLE**
Digitally signed
by NILAM
SANTOSH
KAMBLE
Date: 2026.03.18
14:37:43 +0530

Mr.Aniket Nikam a/w Mr.Vivek Arote, Mr.Akshay Dingale, for the Applicant.

Mr.P.P. Jadhav, APP for Respondent-State.

Mr.J.J. Kulkarni, PSI, DCB, CID, Unit No.2, Mumbai.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 13th MARCH 2026

P.C. :

1. By this Application, the Applicant is seeking regular bail in Crime No.82 of 2020 registered with Goregaon Police Station, Mumbai, for the offences punishable under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471, 409, 420, 120(B) and 201 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short).

2. It is prosecution's case that from period between June 2019 to December 2019 about eight city Survey maps comprising of 22 city survey maps in City Survey Office, Goregaon were fabricated and manipulated.

N.S.Kamble

The manipulation was detected in year 2019 during digitization of records. It is alleged that the Applicant, and co-accused conspired and tampered with city Survey Maps of Goregaon area which were in their custody and showed certain structures constructed on the said property. In fact, there were no structures on the said property, the said tampering was done to reap benefits of illegal constructions.

3. It is contention of the the learned counsel for the Applicant that the Applicant had additional charge of the record room. Due to said additional charge, the Applicant was not able to verify whether the maps were taken outside the office or not. There are no specific allegations against the Applicant of tampering with the maps. The main allegations are against the co-accused Soma Marade about tampering with the maps, but he has been released on bail. The co-accused Shambhuraje Wable, who was City Survey Officer, has also been released on bail. The role attributed to the Applicant is of willful negligence. The Applicant is Government Servant. He is behind bars for almost one year. It may take time to conclude the trial, and requested to allow the Application.

4. It is contention of learned APP that, the Applicant was in-charge of the record room. The original maps were in his custody for the digitization. If the said maps were carried out of his office, it should have

N.S.Kamble

been registered in the Special Register, but no entries were made in the Register. It shows that the said maps were tampered and on the basis of the tampering, some additional properties being constructed were shown in the said map. The Applicant was aware about it, but he intentionally ignored the said fact. It shows involvement of the Applicant in the crime. If the Applicant released on bail, he may abscond or threaten prosecution witnesses, and requested to reject the Application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel. Perused charge-sheet and documents produced on record.

6. Admittedly, the Applicant was in-charge of the record room where the original maps in which the scorings were made and additional structures were shown. It is contention of the learned counsel for the Applicant that Applicant was having additional charge, and therefore he could not pay proper attention to his work. However, at this *prima facie* stage, such contentions cannot be accepted. If any record was taken outside the office, an entry to that effect ought to have been made in the concerned register. It appears that the said maps were taken out of the office without making any entry in register and were tampered with. The role attributed to the co-accused who have been released on bail and present Applicant is different, as the Applicant was custodian of maps which are fabricated and

N.S.Kamble

manipulated for benefit of others, for obvious reasons. It is significant to note that the departmental enquiry is conducted about alleged offence. Following the departmental enquiry, the Applicant was reproached. Considering the nature of the allegations, the role attributed to the Applicant appears to be serious.

7. In view of above, I am not inclined to allow this Application.

ORDER

- (i) The Application is rejected.
- (ii) All pending Applications are disposed of.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)