

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3114 OF 2025**

Jamir Appalal Sayyed ..Applicant
Versus
State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Adv Sabiha Ansari, with Tanvi Rane, Sanobar Sayyed and Aaisha Patel, i/b Hulyalkar & Associates, for the Applicant
Mr. A.R. Metkari, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.
DATE : 22nd JANUARY 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. This is second application for pre-arrest bail. The first application, ABA No. 2088 of 2024 was rejected by this Court by recording reasons on 28th August 2024. Paragraph nos. 9 to 11 of the said order read as under:

“9. Evidently, the fraud is of egregious nature. There is a strong prima facie material to show that the authorities were sought to be deceived into believing that an order was passed in favour of Popat (A1) and other claimants, though the application was rejected by the Minister (Revenue). False and forged order purportedly passed in a quasi-judicial proceedings was

ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL

Digitally signed
by ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL
Date: 2026.01.23
19:08:41 +0530

attempted to be used as genuine.

10. I find substance in the submission of the learned APP that the allegations are of grave nature. The custodial interrogation of the applicants is warranted to unearth the fraud in all its facets and unmask the identity of the persons who were privy to the said fraud.

11. The statements of Santosh A. Sulaskar and Akshay M. Dorge, prima facie, indicate that the applicants and the other co-accused Rakesh, Rahul and Aakash had conspired to have a forged order of the Minister (Revenue). It is true that the witnesses have attributed the source of their information to the statements made by Popat (A1). However, at this stage, the said material is sufficient to prima facie demonstrate the involvement of the applicants in the alleged offences.

3. In view of the aforesaid reasons recorded by this Court, there is no propriety in entertaining this application for pre-arrest bail afresh.

4. Hence the Application stands rejected.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]