



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

AL APPLICATION (APPA) NO.100/2026 IN CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.59/2026

(Subhash Motiram Ingle and another Vs. State of Maharashtra, through Anti Corruption Bureau, A.C.B. Office,
Washim, Tq. and Distt. Washim)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. S.V. Sirpurkar, Advocate for the Appellants.
Ms. S.S. Dhote, A.P.P. for the Respondent/State.

CORAM: NEERAJ P DHOTE, J.

DATED: 4.3.2026.

Heard the learned Advocate for the Appellants and the learned
A.P.P. for the Respondent/State.

2. This is an Application for suspension of sentence awarded by
the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Washim in Special Case
No.2/2009, which reads as under:-

*“1) Accused No.1 Subhash Motiram Ingale & No.2
Nilesh Madhukar Langote are hereby convicted under
Sec.235 of the Criminal Procedure Code for the offence
punishable U/Sec.7, 13(1)(d) r/w Sec.13(2) of the
Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.*

*2) Accused No.1 Subhash Motiram Ingale & No.2
Nilesh Madhukar Langote is hereby convicted and
sentenced to suffer rigorous imprisonment for four years
each and to pay fine of Rs.25,000/- each, in default for
six months imprisonment each for the offence punishable
U/Sec.7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.*

*3) Accused No.1 Subhash Motiram Ingale & No.2 Nilesh
Madhukar Langote is hereby convicted and sentenced to
suffer rigorous Imprisonment for five years each and to
pay fine of Rs.25,000/- each, in default for six months
imprisonment each for the offence punishable
U/Sec.13(1)(d) r/w Sec.13(2) of the Prevention of
Corruption Act, 1988.*

*4) Substantive sentence of imprisonment shall run
concurrently.*

5) Set off if any be given as per rule.

6) Muddemal property i.e. currency notes be returned to concern ACB Office after the appeal period is over.

7) Remaining muddemal property being worthless be destroyed after appeal period is over.

8) Copy of the Judgment be supplied free of cost to the accused.

*9) Bail bonds of the accused stand cancelled.
[Judgment dictated and pronounced in open Court.]”*

3. The prosecution's case, is reproduced from the impugned judgment, as follows:-

The complainant Sanjay Govindrao Deshmukh was working as President of Village Water Supply Committee. For the said committee grants were given by Zilla Parishad. Accused No.1 was working as Account Officer and accused No.2 was working as Assistant in Zilla Parishad, Washim. Therefore, they were public servant. On 15/03/2007 grant of Rs.47,22,693/- was allotted. Out of which two installments were paid to the complainant and thereafter the third installment was due in the year 2008. Hence, the complainant submitted proposal on 01/03/2008 for disbursement of third installment. Therefore, the complainant went in Zilla Parishad, Washim and met with accused Nos.1 and 2. On which accused Nos.1 and 2 told complainant that, disbursement will take time. Therefore, complainant requested for disbursement on which they called him after 2 to 3 days. On 28/05/2008 complainant again requested these accused, on which accused No.2 Langote demanded bribe of Rs.20,000/-for completion of work. Unless and until bribe was paid accused were not ready to complete the work. Therefore, due to

unavoidable situation on 29/05/2008 complainant paid Rs.70,000/- to accused which was distributed by them equally i.e. Rs.8,500/- each. Thereafter accused No.2 Langote asked complainant to bring remaining amount on next date on 30/05/2008. As the complainant was not willing to pay bribe he went in ACB Office and lodged the complaint on 30/05/2008.

4. The learned A.P.P. tendered across the Bar copy of affidavit which is taken on record.

5. According to the learned Advocate for the Appellant, the demand is not proved and there was no verification of demand. The sentence imposed by the learned trial Court is the term sentence. The Appellants have deposited the fine. The Appellants were on bail during the trial. The Appeal is recently admitted. There is no possibility that, the Appeal would be heard in near future.

6. Considering all these aspects of the matter, following order is passed.

ORDER

- i) Application is allowed.
- ii) The Appellants be released on bail on executing P.R. bond for Rs.25,000/- each with one solvent surety in the like amount.
- iii) The Appellants shall co-operate for early hearing of the Appeal.
- iv) The Application stands disposed of in the above terms.

(NEERAJ P. DHOTE, J.)