

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.190 OF 2026

Sonaram Ramuram Chaudhari ...Applicant
Versus
State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

BHALCHANDRA
GOPAL
DUSANE

Digitally signed by
BHALCHANDRA
GOPAL DUSANE
Date: 2026.01.21
20:03:11 +0530

Mr. Kishan Chaudhari, Advocate for Applicants.
Ms. S.M. Yadav, APP for the State.

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.
DATED : 21st January 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Chaudhari, learned Advocate appearing for the Applicant and Ms. Yadav, learned APP for the State.

2. By this application filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ("BNSS"), the Applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with C.R. No.375 of 2023 registered with Wanwadi Police Station, Pune City, for the offences punishable under Sections 120-B, 471, 468, 467, 420, 406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3. The prosecution case and reasoning set out for rejection of Anticipatory Bail Application filed by the Applicant are reflected in

paragraph No.6 of the Order dated 29th October 2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pune in Anticipatory Bail Application No.5524 of 2025, which reads as under”

“6. From perusal of copy of FIR/report, it reveals that, accusations against the applicant is that, in spite knowing fact that, the shop / gala premises was mortgaged with the bank, applicant misrepresented that there is no charge on the said shop and sold it to the informant and his father. The shop / gala appears to have been purchased by the informant and his father on 25.8.2020 and SARFAESI Act notice issued by the society came to the knowledge of the informant on 12.12.2022. The FIR is lodged on 31.7.2023. Thus, there appear delay in lodging FIR. Moreover, it is the contention of applicant that she had already informed the fact of mortgage of the property to the informant and they had agreed to repay the loan amount and she was paid only Rs.31,40,000/- out of agreed consideration amount of Rs.90 Lakhs. The applicant is a woman. The evidence in the matter is of documentary nature. Considering nature of offence, there appear no necessity of custodial interrogation. Prima-facie there appear substance in the contention of applicant that the sale deed is not a fabricated document. The applicant/accused appears to be resident of Pune and she is ready to abide the conditions which may be imposed by the court. There appear no possibility that applicant may flee from justice or misuse her liberty. There appear no substantial reason to reject the application. The conduct of applicant and above facts reveal that apprehension of applicant is reasonable and it justify grant of anticipatory bail to applicant.”

4. As per the prosecution case, the Applicant inspite of knowing the fact that the subject shop/gala was mortgaged with the Bank, mis-represented the First Informant that there is no charge on the said shop/gala and sold the same to the First Informant and his father.

5. Thus, the offence is very serious, where custodial interrogation is necessary.

6. Accordingly, the Applicant is not entitled for grant of Anticipatory Bail, the same is dismissed.

(MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.)