



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.212 OF 2026

Ravindra s/o Sambhaji Waghmare Vs. State of Maharashtra

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

Shri M.V. Rai, Advocate for applicant.

Shri C.A. Lokhande, AGP / APP for respondent/State.

CORAM : RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.

DATE : 16.04.2026.

1. Apprehending the arrest in connection with Crime No.319/2026 registered with Police Station, Ramnagar, Chandrapur for the offences punishable under Sections 473, 472, 471, 468, 464, 465, 406, 420 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (for short, "IPC"), the applicant/accused no.2 has approached this Court.

2. The report was lodged by the informant named, Kaustub Vilas Ade. In the First Information Report, it has been alleged that in the year 2014, all the accused persons, under pretext of providing him a job, accepted an amount of ₹50,000/- initially and finally ₹8,50,000/-. It is further alleged that under the same pretext, from various persons, total amount of ₹1,31,60,000/- was obtained. It was alleged in the First Information Report that thereafter all the candidates were informed that they would have to undergo certain training as the candidates were selected and, therefore, all were taken to Kolkata by flight. In the said flight, the applicant and Surendra Ramkrishn

Tenang/accused no.3 were also present. It was alleged that at Kolkata the informant and other candidates were taken to a hotel and thereafter various training schools and even the certificate was handed over to them. It was further alleged that bogus letter for police verification was also given to them. According to the First Information Report, the applicant stayed at Kolkata for 1 ½ year but thereafter the accused person did not contact him. It was further alleged in the First Information Report that though repeated request were made to accused No.1 – Mujibur Latif Qureshi, he did not return the amount accepted. The informant also came to know that said Qureshi was lodged in Nanded Jail since last one year as he had committed similar types of offences. It is in this background, the First Information Report was lodged.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that there is a delay in lodging the First Information Report. He submitted that the conduct of informant in not approaching the police authority within reasonable period speaks volume for itself. He submitted that there is absolutely no material available on record to show that applicant has accepted any amount.

4. Per contra, learned APP has submitted that the allegations made against the present applicant are of serious nature. A categorical statement is made in the First Information Report by the informant that in the year 2014 the present applicant, alongwith others, have demanded the amount of ₹8,50,000/-. He further submitted that in First

Information Report it is stated that several persons were duped under pretext of giving the job and the amount involved is ₹1,31,60,000/-. He also submitted that there was absolutely no reason for the applicant to accompany the informant and other persons to Kolkata and taking them to various training centres. According to the learned APP, even bogus certificates were issued in their favour. To buttress his contention, he has produced the case diary for my perusal.

5. The statements of witnesses clearly show that the applicant has accepted the amounts from one of the candidates. The forged documents are also part of the case diary. The witnesses have specifically stated about the role performed by the present applicant i.e. assurance given by the present applicant, acceptance of amount and taking them to Kolkata and further to different training centres. The investigation is at initial stage. Though there is a delay in lodging First Information Report but the contents of First Information Report itself show that repeated demands were made by all the applicants for return of amounts, which was not honoured. Delay in lodging First Information Report may not itself be a ground for allowing the bail application.

6. Considering the seriousness of matter and the amount involved, I am not inclined to allow the present application. Hence, application is rejected.

(Rajnish R. Vyas, J.)

Wagh