

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.352 OF 2026

Prashant Murlidhar Raje

... Applicant

Vs.

State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.503 OF 2026
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.352 OF 2026**

Ms. Sofiya Shaikh for the Applicant.

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

Mr. Shashvat Jariwala a/w Drishti Israni i/by Auroma Law for the
Intervenor-first informant.

PSI Rampure, IO, WPSI More, Pairavi, BKC Police Station are present.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.

DATE : 25TH FEBRUARY 2026

PC. :

1. Mentioned out of turn.
2. This is an Application for anticipatory bail.
3. The Applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No.770 of 2025 registered with Bandra Kurla Complex Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 314, 318(2), 336(2), 336(3), 344 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

4. The Applicant was working as Accounts Manager with the Capital Business Co-operative Society Limited. The first informant is the Chairman of the Capital Business Co-operative Society Limited. It is alleged that during the audit of the said society, it was found that the applicant had prepared fraudulent bills in respect of certain work and misappropriated the amount of Rs.1,39,55,036/-.

5. I have heard Learned Counsel for the Applicant, Learned APP for the Respondent-State and Learned Counsel for the Intervenor-first informant.

6. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Society used to verify the work done by the concerned vendors and then only used to issue cheque in the name of the concerned vendors. It is submitted that with some ulterior motive, false allegations are made against the present Applicant. It is submitted that there is no need of custodial interrogation and the Applicant is ready and willing to cooperate in the investigation.

7. On the other hand, Learned APP for the Respondent-State and Learned Counsel for the Intervenor submit that false bills were procured by the Applicant from the various vendors, though they did not carry out any work. It is submitted that there are statements of vendors to that effect . It is submitted that the Applicant is involved in two more crimes of similar nature. It is submitted that considering the nature of crime, the Applicant may not be released on anticipatory bail.

8. I have perused the statements of witnesses, viz., Raju Tukaram Kanawade and Jatin Shashikant Vaity. It appears from the statement of the said witnesses that the present Applicant had procured false bills from them. The Applicant is involved in two more crimes of similar nature. Considering the overall facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to release the Applicant on anticipatory bail. Hence, the present Anticipatory Bail Application is rejected.

9. Pending Interim Application stands disposed of.

(N.R. BORKAR, J.)