

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO. 1286 OF 2025

1. Rajesh s/o Kashinathrao Masurkar,
Age:- Occ:- Secretary,
Add: 168, Omnagar Nagpur 440024.
2. Sangita d/o Vishwanath Rahate,
Age:- 58 years, Occ:- President Sudhir
Shikshan Sanstha Nagpur,
Add: 168, Omnagar Nagpur 440024.
3. Sau Bharti w/o Deepakrao Khadase,
Age:- 50 years, Occ:- Private,
R/o 32 Aradhana Nagar, Nagpur.
4. Ku Aaishwaraya d/o Rajesh Masurkar,
Age: Occ:- Private,
Add: 168, Omnagar Nagpur 440024.
5. Prakash Kashinathrao Masurkar,
Age:- 60 years, Occ:- Private,
Add:- 104, Omnagar Nagpur 440024.
6. Sunita Lakshmanrao Zode,
Age 58 years, Occ:- Private,
Add:- 104, Omnagar Nagpur 440024.
7. Aruna w/o Ramesh Bante,
Age:- 60 years Occ:- Retired Principal,
Add:- 100, sarvashree nagar,
Nagpur-34.

APPLICANTS

Versus

1. State of Maharashtra,
Thr. P.S. Hudkeshwar Dist:- Nagpur.
2. Ku. Nilkamal d/o Krupakar Borkar,
Age 45 years, Occ:- Teacher,
R/o Plot No 87, Vitthal Nagar 02
Near Panchaleshwar Temple,
P S. Hudkeshwar Nagpur
Phone No 8007918099
Email :- nilkamalganjare@gmail.com **NON-APPLICANTS**

Mr. N.M. Gaidhane, Advocate for the Applicants.
Mr. N.H. Joshi, APP for the Non-applicant No.1/State.
Mr. D.S. Jagyasi, Advocate for the Non-applicant No.2.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI PHALKE, J.

DATED : 09th MARCH, 2026.

ORAL JUDGMENT :-

1. Heard.
2. **ADMIT.** Heard finally by the consent of learned Counsel for the respective parties.
3. The present Application is preferred by the Applicants under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha

Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, for quashing of the First Information Report in connection with Crime No.332/2025 registered with Police Station Hudkeshwar, District Nagpur for the offence punishable under Sections 167, 420, 465, 468, 217, 471 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (for short “IPC”).

4. The crime is registered on the basis of a report lodged by the Non-applicant No.2/ Nilkamal Borkar on an allegation that on 31.01.2024, after one year of lodging complaint, FIR came to be registered against total 9 accused persons including the present Applicants. It is contended that, earlier also she has filed the complaint but NC case was registered against the present Applicants. As per her allegations, the complainant was appointed on 01.07.2005 as Assistant Teacher for Class 1 to 4 Standard as of Marathi School Sarvashree Uccha Prathamik Vidyalay run by the Applicant No.1 under the name of Sudhir Shikshan Santha. It is alleged that, during 30.09.2023 to 16.02.2024 the Applicant No.1 alongwith other Applicants i.e. the office bearers and Teacher Aruna Bante had misused their office and prepared false documents and used them as genuine. During investigation it reveals that, on

30.09.2023, the Applicant No. 7 retired who was the then Principal. The complainant was appointed on 01.07.2005 but her appointment shown from 26.06.2007 and by which promotion was denied to the complainant on the post of Principal. The Education Officer was directed by the Deputy Director of Education on 01.01.2025 to enquire and accordingly the enquiry was conducted, and thereafter, the FIR came to be registered against the present Applicants. On the basis of the said report Police have registered the crime against the present Applicants.

5. Heard learned Counsel for the Applicants, who submitted that, Applicant No. 1 is Secretary of reputed education Trust Sudhir Shikshan Sanstha Nagpur, while Applicant No. 2 is President of said Trust and Applicant Nos. 3 to 6 are Trustees of the said Trust. It is submitted that, Applicant No. 7 is Retired Principal of said Sudhir Shikshan Sanstha Nagpur. The Non-applicant No. 2 is the Complainant as well as ex-teacher worked in Marathi School of Sarvashree Ucha Pratmik Vidyalaya run under the said Sudhir Shikshan Sanstha

and now she is working as a Teacher in Sarswati Uccha Prathmik Shala, Binaki Mangalwari.

6. It is submitted by the learned Counsel for the Applicants that, the entire allegations levelled against the present Applicants are of civil nature and only remedy available to the present Applicants is before the School Tribunal. By no stretch of imagination it can be said that, any criminal offence is made out against the present Applicants. He submitted that, even the enquiry report of the Education Officer nowhere reveals any offence is committed by the present Applicants. He submitted that the enquiry report only reveals that, the present Applicants could not produce the letters of the parents who have withdrawn the admissions of their children and thereby the reference was made to close the 1 to 4 classes from the said School. He submitted that, even the resolution which is passed is also to show that the issue pending was regarding the promotion to Non-applicant No.2. As a promotion was denied to her, therefore, this false report came to be lodged against the present Applicants. He submitted that, the allegations that the number of students intentionally recorded to be zero on

30.09.2023, is baseless, false and without any substance. The allegation that, the complainant intentionally declared surplus and it affects her seniority, is also baseless and false one and no criminal offence is made out from that. Thus, he submitted that even accepting the allegations as it is, there is nothing on record to show that, there was intention since inception or all the Applicants entered into the agreement to do an illegal act and in view of that they entered into the conspiracy and thereby committed an offence. He submitted that, there is nothing on record to show that, the present Applicants have committed any forgery regarding the documents as the enquiry report also nowhere reveals that the forged documents are prepared by the present Applicants, and therefore, the Application deserves to be allowed.

7. *Per contra*, learned APP and the learned Counsel for the Non-applicant No. 2, strongly opposed the said contention and invited my attention towards the communication of Deputy Director of Education to the Education Officer dated 12.06.2024, by which the enquiry initiated regarding the issue. The enquiry report is also on record. The substance of the

enquiry report shows that, the Applicants are responsible for the illegal act and thereby the permission granted for classes 1 to 4 was rejected. They have also invited my attention towards the resolution passed by the present Applicants and submitted that the resolution itself shows that to deprive the Non-applicant No.2 from getting the promotion intentionally the record was prepared to show that there are no students, and therefore, the Non-applicant No.2 became surplus and her services are terminated. Thus, they submitted that, considering the entire record, sufficient to attract the offence punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468, 217 and 471 read with Section 120-B of IPC, and therefore, the Application deserves to be rejected.

8. After hearing both the sides and on perusal of the recitals of the FIR and the entire investigation papers, the issue involved in the present crime is that, the Non-applicant No.2 was serving as a Teacher and it is alleged by her that, she was due for promotion and at that time intentionally the present Applicants have reduced the students to deprive her from getting promotion and she was shown to be surplus by showing the another Teacher Hemraj Dhote as senior to her and thereby

promotion was denied to her and for that purpose the false and fabricated documents were prepared.

9. On perusal of the entire investigation papers and documents filed on record shows that, the issue regarding reducing the number of students is concerned, the enquiry was conducted. The enquiry report shows that, in September 2023 there were 93 students and on 30.09.2023, 87 students were there. During enquiry the Applicants have not produced any letters or the request letters of the parents of the students who have withdrawn the admissions of the students from their school. The point No.5 of the said enquiry report shows that:

“५. वरील मुददा क्र. 13 नुसार एकाही पालकांचे T.C. मिळण्याबाबतचे अर्ज उपलब्ध नसल्याचे चौकशीत दिसून आले. तसेच 4 सप्टेंबर 2023 नंतर एकाच वेळी सर्व विद्यार्थ्यांच्या T.C. देण्याची कार्यवाही शाळा प्रशासनाकडून झाल्याचे दिसून येते.

६. वरील मुददा क्र. 6 अन्वये 30 सप्टेंबर 2023 रोजी अनुदानित वर्ग 1 ते 4 ची पटसंख्या 0 (शून्य) झाल्याने संस्था शाळा बंद करण्याचा प्रस्ताव सादर करण्याच्या विचाराधीन असल्याचे संस्था सचिव यांच्या पत्रात नमूद असल्याचे दिसून येते”

10. I have perused the resolution also, the resolution passed, which reads as under:

कार्यकारी मंडळ संभा रतिकृत

82

रुग्धीर शिक्षण संस्था, नागपूर च्या दि. १८.०५.२०२३ च्या सूचनेनुसार आज दि. २४.०५.२०२३ ला सकाळी १०.३० वाजता संमेलना सुरुवात झाली व संमेलना संचालित सन्माननीय फताविकारी उपस्थित उपस्थित.

- | | | |
|-----------|--|------------------|
| अ.क्र. ०१ | पदाधिकाऱ्यांचे जा व कु. संगीता विश्वनाथराव रहाटे | स्वक्षरी |
| ०२ | सौ. भारती दिपकुराव रवडसे | आरती खडसे |
| ०३ | कु. ऐश्वर्या राजेश मासुरकर | Adharyu masurkar |
| ०४ | डॉ. राजेश काशिनाथराव मासुरकर | Dr. Rajesh |
| ०५ | डॉ. प्रभाश. काशिनाथराव मासुरकर | Dr. Prabhash |
| ०६ | डॉ. सुनील उदयभाळ ताकडे | सुनील ताकडे |
| ०७ | कु. सुनिता लक्ष्मणराव खोडे | कु. सुनील खोडे |

आजच्या संमेलने अध्यक्षस्थान संस्थेच्या मा. अध्यक्षा कु. संगीता विश्वनाथराव रहाटे यांनी भूषावे जसा ठराव डॉ. सुनील उदयभाळ ताकडे यांनी मांडला व या प्रस्तावाला सौ. भारती दिपकुराव खडसे यांनी अनुमोदन दिले. उपस्थित पदाधिकाऱ्यांनी या प्रस्तावास मंजुरी दिली व त्यानुसार आजच्या संमेलने अध्यक्षस्थान कु. संगीता विश्वनाथराव रहाटे यांनी स्वीकारले व मा. अध्यक्षांनी विषयपत्रिकेनुसार संमेलना कामकाजास सुरुवात केली.

विषयक्र. ०१: मागील संमेलने रतिकृत कायम करण्याबाबत.

83

सुधीर शिक्षण संस्थेची कार्यकारी मंडळाची सभा दि. ०६.०९.२०२३ ला संपन्न झाली या सभेचे इतिवृत मा. सचिवांनी उपस्थित सभासदांना वाचून दाखविले व ते सभेत झालेल्या कार्यवाहीनुसार असल्यामुळे कायम करून पूर्णित करण्यात आले.

विषय क्र. ०२: सर्व्ही उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर चा कार्यभार श्री. हेमराज बाबुराव शोटे यांना सोपविण्याबाबत.

सुधीर शिक्षण संस्था, नागपूर द्वारा संचालित सर्व्ही उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर येथील प्रभारी मुख्याध्यापिका कु. अरुणा रमेशराव बांत या नियत वेळोवेळीनुसार दि. ३०.०९.२०२३ ला सेवानिवृत्त होत आहेत. सुधीर शिक्षण संस्थेच्या सर्व्ही उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर व सर्व्ही प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर अशा दोन प्राथमिक शाळांचे संचालन करण्यात येते. दोन्ही शाळांच्या संयुक्त निवाजनेनुसार श्री. हेमराज बाबुराव शोटे हे संचालक शिक्षक असल्यामुळे सर्व्ही उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर चा कार्यभार त्यांचे कु. सोपविण्याबाबतचा प्रस्ताव मा. सचिवांनी आजच्या सभेला उपस्थित पदाधिकाऱ्यांसमक्ष मांडला तसेच दोन्ही शाळांचे अर्थरत शिक्षकांची सेवानिवृत्तता यादी (सर्व शिक्षकांच्या स्वक्षरीसह) निदर्शनास आणून दिली.

यावर उपस्थित पदाधिकाऱ्यांनी स्तविस्तर चर्चा केली श्री. हेमराज शोटे यांना प्रशासन सभासदांच्या १६ वर्षांचा प्रदीर्घ अनुभवसुद्धा आहे व त्यांनी हे पद सांभाळण्यास स्वतःमतीसुद्धा दिलेली आहे. त्यामुळे उपस्थित पदाधिकाऱ्यांनी त्यांचे नोवास्त परवानगी देण्यास हरकत नसल्याचे नमूद अंती ठरविले व पूर्वी ठराव स्वतःमते पारित करण्यात आला.

४४

"सुधीर शिक्षण संस्था, नागपूर द्वारा संचालित सर्वज्ञ उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूरच्या पुढारी मुख्याध्यापक पदावर, जी. हेमराज बाबुराव घोटे या कार्यभार देण्यात यावा तसेच त्यांच्या प्रस्ताव आकष्यक त्या दस्तावेजांसह मा. शिक्षणाधिकारी (प्राथमिक) जिल्हा परीषद, नागपूर यांचेकडे (आर्थिक व प्रशासकीय) जाविऊन, मिळणावावत आदर, उरव्यात यावा"

द्वारा स्वनिवृत्त झाल्यावर उरव्यात आसा.

विषय क्र. ०३: सर्वज्ञ उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर येथील कार्यरत सहा. शिक्षिका कु. निरुपमा कृपाकर बोरकर यांना जातिरीक्त ठरविण्याबाबत.

सुधीर शिक्षण संस्था, नागपूर द्वारा संचालित सर्वज्ञ उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर येथे वर्ग १ ते ७ चे वर्ग शासन मान्यता व शिक्षणाधिकारी (प्राथमिक) जिल्हा परीषद, नागपूर यांनी परवानगीने सुरू आहेत. वर्ग १ ते ४ चे वर्ग १०० टक्के अनुदानित असून २०२२-२०२३ च्या संच मान्यतेत ०२ शिक्षकांची पदे सुधीर आहेत. ०२ शिक्षकांची कु. अरुणा रमेशराव बाबुराव घोटे यांना दि. ३०.०३.२०२३ ला सेवानिवृत्त झाल्या तसेच स्टंट पॉस्ट २०२२-२०२४ सत्रात वर्ग १ ते ४ ची पदसंख्या दि. ३०.०३.२०२३ ला ०२ (दोन) आहे.

सद्यस्थितीत वर्ग १ ते ४, १०० टक्के अनुदानित शाबेत स. शिक्षिका कु. निरुपमा कृपाकर बोरकर कार्यरत आहेत परंतु विद्यार्थी संख्या शून्य असल्यामुळे त्यांना जातिरीक्त असलेल्या शिक्षकांचे समायोजन करण्यात शासकीय धोरणानुसार मा. शिक्षणाधिकारी (प्राथमिक) जिल्हा परीषद, नागपूर कोकलियांस प्रस्ताव पाठविण्यात यावा. अशी वस्तुस्थिती मा. सनिवांनी उपस्थित पदाधिका

(17)

४५

पिशाद केली व स्टूडंटल पोर्टल ची प्रत खादर केली
तसेच सेवाजोषणा यादी उपलब्ध करून दिली
उपलब्ध पुराव्यांचे निरीक्षण करून त्याची सत्यता
पडताळून खादर विषयावर उपस्थित पदाधिकाऱ्यांनी
संविस्तर चर्चा केली व पूर्वील ठराव संपन्नितुमते मंजूर
करण्यात आला.

सुधीर शिक्षण संस्था, नागपूर द्वारा संचालित
राज्यीय उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय, नागपूर येथे वर्ग १ ते
४ चे वर्ग १०० टक्के अनुदानावर असून वर्ग ५ चे
वर्ग किंवा अनुदान तत्वावर खुरे आहेत, स्टूडंट पोर्टल
वर स. ३०.०९.२०२५ च्या पटसंरब्धनुसार ८० रुपय
विद्यार्थी संख्या असल्यामुळे कु. मिलकुमल कृपाकर
बोरकर त्यांना आतिरीक्त करविण्यात येत असून त्यांचा
प्रस्ताव मा. शिक्षणाधीकारी (प्राथ.) रेजिस्ट्रार परीषद, नागपूर
कार्यालयात जावरथात त्या दस्तबिजांसह पाठविण्यात यावा.
नक्षेत्र आतिरीक्त असलेल्या शिक्षकांचे समायोजन इतर
दोस्त करण्याचे धोरणानुसार त्यांना सहकार्य करावे.

ठराव संपन्नितुमते मंजूर करण्यात आला.

यामंतर सभेपुढे उणेताही विषय नसल्यामुळे
आजच्या सभेच्या अखेरीसचे आभार मानण्यात आले
तसेच इतर उपस्थित मा. पदाधिकाऱ्यांचे आभार
मानण्यात आले व सभा समाप्तीची घोषणा करण्यात
आली.

Signature
मा. अध्यक्षा.

मुख्याध्यापिका
सर्वश्री उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय
सर्वश्री नगर नागपूर-३४

अध्यक्षा
सुधीर शिक्षण संस्था
१६८, ओमनगर, नागपूर

11. Thus, in the Enquiry Report dated 12.06.2024 submitted to the Non-Applicant No. 1 on 24.10.2024 Education Department in which found that upon Muster Roll of the School, 93 Students were on record on 04.09.2023, however, on 30.09.2023 U-dias portal shown the strength of student of Class 1 to 4 as zero. 43 transfer Certificates of the students were given from 04.07.2023 to 28.09.2023 by the sign of Applicant No.7 rest of the 50 students Transfer Certificates does not bear entry in the Transfer Certificate Register. The Applicants as per the enquiry report failed to show any application from the parents for issuance of Transfer Certificates of their children. It shows that, as per the allegations the present Applicants have prepared false and bogus documents. However, this allegation is not substantiated by any material as the Enquiry Report nowhere shows that it was the present Applicants who have prepared the forged documents. It only show that, they could not produce the documents to show that, the parents have withdrawn the admissions from the said School. Thus, by no stretch of imagination it can be said that, the present Applicants are involved in the commission of offence by preparing the false and forged documents.

12. At the most, this issue can be referred or resorted to by the School Tribunal by entertaining the grievance of the Non-applicant No.2.

13. Before considering the other allegations levelled against the present Applicants, it is necessary to see the parameters laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***State of Harayana & Ors. Vs. Ch. Bhajan Lal & Ors., 1992 AIR 604***, which reads as under:

“(1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that

there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

14. In the light of the above said parameters the entire facts and circumstances of the present case are to be looked into which revolves around the issue regarding reducing the number of students which initially admitted in the School and subsequently withdrawn their admissions. As far as the forgery is concerned, admittedly, there is no material on record to show that exactly who has committed the said forged act.

15. To constitute an offence under Section 420 of IPC there has to be (1) Deception of any person, either by making a false or misleading representation or by other action or by omission; (2) Fraudulently or dishonestly inducing any person to deliver any property, or (3) The consent that any person shall

retain any property and finally intentionally inducing that person to do or omit to do anything which he would not do or omit.

16. In the present Application for the offence punishable under Section 420 of IPC, the intention since inception is required, which is absent in the present case.

17. To attract the offence punishable under Section 120-B of IPC, the elements of a criminal conspiracy have been stated to be: (a) an object to be accomplished, (b) a plan or scheme embodying means to accomplish that object, (c) an agreement or understanding between two or more of the accused persons whereby they become definitely committed to co-operate for the accomplishment of the object by the means embodied in the agreement, or by any effectual means, (d) in the jurisdiction where the statute required an overt act. The essence of a criminal conspiracy is the unlawful combination and ordinarily the offence is complete when the combination is framed. Admittedly, no direct evidence would be available to prove the conspiracy but there has to be some material on

record to show that there was a conspiracy entered into by the present Applicants.

18. On the plain reading of the complaint fails to spell out any of the aforesaid ingredients noted above. If it is a case of the Complainant that the present Applicants have committed an offence of a forgery than there has to be some material to show that, who has actually done the act of forgery and benefited by the same.

19. The learned Counsel for the Applicants, has rightly submitted that at the most this issue can be resolved before the School Tribunal by making a grievance to the School Tribunal regarding the seniority of the Non-applicant No.2 is concerned.

20. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Delhi Race Club (1940) Limited & Ors., Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr., (2024) 10 SCC 690*, wherein it is observed that, even after making that allowance, we find that the complaint does not disclose the commission of any offence on the part of the respondents under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. There is nothing in the complaint to show that the respondents

had dishonest or fraudulent intention at the time of the incident. The fact that the respondents subsequently did not abide by their commitment that they would show the appellant to be the proprietor of Drang Transport Corporation and would also render accounts to him in the month of December might create civil liability for them but this fact would not be sufficient to fasten criminal liability on the respondents for the offence of cheating.

21. To put it in other words, the case of cheating dishonest intention starts with the very inception of the transaction. But in the present case, admittedly, there is nothing on record to show that there was intention since inception to commit such type of offence, and therefore, any record is prepared by the present Applicants.

22. In the light of the above facts and circumstances of the present case, as observed earlier, at the most the grievance can be referred by the Non-applicant No.2 before the School Tribunal regarding her seniority is concerned. As far as criminal offence is concerned, no criminal offence is made out from the

recitals of the FIR as well as from the various statements recorded by the Investigating Agency, and therefore, no criminal offence is made out from the said investigation carried out by the Investigating Officer.

23. In the case of ***Achin Gupta Vs. State of Haryana & Anr., 2024 SCC OnLine SC 759***, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:

“19. It is now well settled that the power under Section 482 of the Cr. P.C. has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution, only where such exercise is justified by the tests laid down in the Section itself. It is also well settled that Section 482 of the Cr. P.C. does not confer any new power on the High Court but only saves the inherent power, which the Court possessed before the enactment of the Criminal Procedure Code. There are three circumstances under which the inherent jurisdiction may be exercised, namely (i) to give effect to an order under the Code, (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of Court, and (iii) to otherwise secure the ends of justice.

24. In the case of ***Paramjeet Batra Vs. State of Uttarakhand & Ors., 2013(11) SCC 673***, the Hon'ble Apex Court in paragraph No.12 has observed as under:-

“12. While exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code the High Court has to be cautious. This power is to be used sparingly and only for the purpose of preventing abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure ends of justice. Whether a complaint discloses a criminal offence or not depends upon the nature of facts alleged

therein. Whether essential ingredients of criminal offence are present or not has to be judged by the High court. A complaint disclosing civil transactions may also have a criminal texture. But the High Court must see whether a dispute which is essentially of a civil nature is given a cloak of criminal offence. In such a situation, if a civil remedy is available and is, in fact, adopted as has happened in this case, the High court should not hesitate to quash the criminal proceedings to prevent abuse of process of the court.”

25. The ingredients of cheating as defined under Section 415 of IPC are not made out even accepting the allegations in the complaint at their face value, as well as the offence under Sections 465, 468, 471 of IPC are also not made as there is nothing on record to show that who from the present Applicants have prepared the forged documents. In fact, there is nothing on record to show that the forged record is prepared by the present Applicants and the said forged record was used by them. In view of that, the Application deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order.

ORDER

- i. Criminal Application is **allowed**.
- ii. The First Information Report in connection with Crime No. 332/2025 registered with Police Station

Hudkeshwar, District Nagpur for the offence punishable under Sections 167, 420, 465, 468, 217, 471 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, is hereby quashed and set aside to the extent of the present Applicants.

26. Pending application/s, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(URMILA JOSHI PHALKE, J.)

S.D.Bhimte