

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2785 OF 2025

Khushal Singh s/o. Hari Singh
V/s.

...Applicant

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent.

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4779 OF 2025

.....
Mr. Satyavrat Joshi (through VC) a/w. Mr. Nitin Pai i/b Ms Shivani
Sunil Kondekar for the Applicants in ABAs.

Mr. S.R. Agarkar, APP for the Respondent/State.

Ms Dhara Shah (through VC) i/b Mr. Satish J. Agarwal for the
Intervener/first informant in both IAs.

PI Manoj Patil, Malad Police Station is present.

.....
CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 08.01.2026.

P.C. :

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail.
2. The applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No.432 of 2025 registered at Malad Police Station for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 3(5) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. It is the case of the prosecution that the present applicant and other co-accused had induced the first informant and other investors to invest money in forex trading by assuring them good returns and defrauded them to the tune of Rs.1 crore.
4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant the learned APP for the respondent No.1/State and the learned

counsel for the intervener/first informant.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the main allegations are against the co-accused Dinesh Singh and not the present applicant. It is submitted that even promissory notes were executed by the co-accused Dinesh Singh. It is submitted that there is no need of custodial interrogation and the applicant is ready and willing to cooperate in the investigation.

6. On the other hand, learned APP for the respondent No.1/State and the learned counsel for the first informant submits that the amount was handed over to the present applicant. It is submitted that there are specific allegation of inducement against the present applicant. It is submitted that the applicant is involved in 11 more crimes of similar nature. It is thus submitted that the applicant may not be released on anticipatory bail.

7. I have perused the first information report and the statements of witnesses. There are specific allegations against the present applicant in relation to the inducement. The present applicant appears to be the beneficiary of the defrauded amount. Considering the said fact and as the applicant is involved in 11 more crimes of similar nature, I am not inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail. Hence, the Application is rejected.

8. The Interim Application stands disposed of.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]