



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 933 OF 2025
Vinod S/o. Shyamrao Soyam Vs. State of Maharashtra

WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 966 OF 2025
Sachin Manohar Dongre Vs. State of Maharashtra

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

(In ABA No. 933/2025)

Shri J. B. Kasat, Advocate for applicant.
Shri N. R. Rode, APP for non-applicant/State.
Shri Amit D. Bhate, Advocate for assist to prosecution.

(In ABA No. 966/2025)

Shri H. S. Chitaley, Advocate for applicant.
Shri S. B. Bissa, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM :- M. W. CHANDWANI, J.

DATED :- 27.01.2026

Heard.

2. Both the applications are arising out of the same crime i.e. Crime No. 724/2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station Warora, District Chandrapur and therefore, they are being disposed of by this common order.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant in ABA No. 933/2025 vehemently submitted that false allegations have been levelled against the applicant for receiving the

amount for handing over the gold. According to him, there is a delay in lodging the First Information Report (FIR).

4. According to the learned counsel, the contention of the complainant itself shows that the story is a concocted one. Within a short span of time, huge collection of the amount to the tune of Rs.81 lakhs is doubtful. The complainant- Akshay Soni, who is an employee of Dhanshree Art Jewellery collected the amount. Along with the owner of the shop- Gajanan Patil, he went to Warora to collect the gold. In spite of the allegation that applicant- Vinod Soyam ran away from the spot, no immediate steps were taken and therefore, according to him, the story is concocted and not believable. Therefore, the applicant is required to be protected by this Court.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant in ABA No. 966/2025 submitted that no amount was handed over to applicant- Sachin Dongre. Rather, after the amount was handed over to main accused- Vinod Soyam, he was continuously in touch with the complainant and used to assist in locating the whereabouts of the main accused- Vinod Soyam. He further submits that the applicant has co-operated in the investigation as directed in the interim order of this Court and therefore, he is required to be protected.

6. As against this, the learned APP and the learned counsel assisting the prosecution submitted that both the applicants are hand-in-glove with each other. Applicant- Sachin Dongre introduced the complainant to applicant- Vinod Soyam. The main accused- Vinod Soyam was interested in selling gold at discounted rate of Rs.90 lakhs. He took the amount from the complainant and other persons who contributed in the total amount of Rs.81 lakhs. The complainant went to the spot of incident to collect the gold and pay the amount but the main accused ran away after collecting the amount, without handing over the gold. Thereafter, the complainant and other persons who had contributed to raise the amount tried to trace the main accused but nothing fruitful happened and therefore, the FIR came to be lodged.

7. It is submitted by the learned APP that a similar type of offence is registered against both the applicants, wherein similar modus-oprendi was adopted by both the applicants. Therefore, he sought rejection of the application.

8. Perusal of the case-diary reveals that the complainant, who is an employee of one Gajanan Patil, the proprietor of Dhanshree Art Jewellery was informed by one Bhagwan Hazare that the some persons are interested in selling gold valued at Rs.96 lakhs at a discounted price of Rs.90 lakhs. Therefore, the

complainant and other persons collected the amount to the tune of Rs.81 lakhs and went to the house of the main accused.

9. The complainant along with other persons took the amount and went to co-accused- Sachin Dongre who took them to main accused- Vinod Soyam at Warora. The case-diary reveals that both the applicants were present in the house. The amount of Rs.81 lakhs was handed over to Vinod Soyam and thereafter, he asked them to wait, saying that he will bring the gold. However, he never returned.

10. Thus, *prima facie* it appears that Vinod Soyam on the promise of selling gold valued at Rs.96 lakhs at a discounted price of Rs.90 lakhs, took the amount and absconded. The complainant and other persons waited for a considerable period at the spot but he did not bother to handover the gold.

11. It appears that another crime has been registered against the applicants with Chandrapur Police Station on similar allegations. FIR No. 38/2026 registered with Chandrapur Police Station reveals that a similar type of modus-operandi is adopted by both the applicants to other victims who are the complainants in that crime. Thus, though no amount was parted with by applicant- Sachin Dongre but the allegations in other offences which have occurred prior to 04.11.2025 allege

similar type of allegations that Sachin Dongre introduced Vinod Soyam to the complainant and other victims.

12. Thus, there is a *prima faice* case which shows the involvement of both the applicants in commission of the crime registered against them.

13. No progress has been made in the investigation till date and unless effective custodial interrogation is done in this crime, the dots will not connect. Nothing is seized in the crime till date; rather, applicant- Vinod Soyam is absconding.

14. Considering the nature of allegations and the fact that the investigation is at a preliminary stage, if the applicants are protected by granting anticipatory bail, they will not assist the Investigating Officer in cracking the offence. Therefore, in my view, the applicants do not deserve the extra ordinary relief of bail.

15. Hence, both the applications are rejected.

(M. W. CHANDWANI, J.)