



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 36 OF 2026

Prashant Rambhau Patil

Vs.

The 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

Ms. Fatima Pathan, Advocate for applicant.
Ms. M. R. Kavimandan, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM :- M. W. CHANDWANI, J.

DATED :- 12.02.2026

Heard.

2. The applicant seeks anticipatory bail in connection with Crime No. 867/2025 registered with Police Station Ramtek, Dist. Nagpur for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 340(2), 336(3) r/w. 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State.

4. Having gone through the First Information Report and the case-diary, it is revealed that Smt. Shewantabai Harichandra Madavi, a tribal, and other sold the field Survey No. 146/1 and 146/8 to co-accused by a registered sale-deed. In the said sale-deed, one forged document regarding the permission granted by the

Collector with a fake seal and signature to seller-Shewantabai to sell the said field to a non-tribal was annexed. Later on, the Sub-Divisional Officer, Ramtek got to know about the forged permission order allegedly issued by the Collector and therefore, the aforesaid offence initially came to be registered against one Prakash Kumbhare, the purchaser.

5. During investigation, it was revealed that one Pramod Jaiswal, who had financed the transaction and is the actual purchaser, got the document from one Keshav Pawankar and provided it to Prakash Kumbhare. During interrogation of Keshav Pawankar, the name of the present applicant cropped up. Thus, the allegation against the present applicant is that he provided fake permission order of the Collector to sell the said land bearing a fake seal and signature of the Collector.

6. It is also brought to the knowledge of this Court that similar offences are also registered against the applicant in Nagpur and Chandrapur City for making forged documents such as certificates issued by the Caste Scrutiny Committee etc.

7. Considering the nature of allegation against the applicant, more particularly, to find out where the document was prepared; where the forged seal of the Collector was made for preparing the document, effective interrogation of the applicant is necessary which can only

be possible during custodial interrogation of the applicant.

8. Considering the material available against the applicant regarding his involvement in the crime, coupled with the criminal antecedents of the applicant; in my view, discretion of granting anticipatory bail cannot be exercised in favour of the applicant.

9. Sofaras, submission of the learned counsel for the applicant that criminal antecedents of the accused cannot be a ground to reject anticipatory bail as well as the reliance placed by her upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Ayub Khan Vs. State of Rajasthan [2024 SCC Online SC 3763]*** is concerned, let me state that the reliance placed by the learned counsel for the applicant is misplaced, since the High Court had rejected the anticipatory bail in that case only on the ground of criminal antecedents and therefore, in that scenario, the Supreme Court had held that it is not permissible. However, in the present case, *prima facie* there is material to show the active involvement of the present applicant in the crime apart from its criminal antecedents.

10. Therefore, in view of the above, the application is rejected.

(M. W. CHANDWANI, J.)