

MHSO050009892026



Criminal B A No.496/2026

Sanmukh Mahadev Chougule

Versus

State of Maharashtra

A) Case Details :	
FIR Number and Date	624/2026
Police Station	Mangalwedha Police Station
District	Solapur
State	Maharashtra
Sections Invoked	Sec. 420, 467, 468, 471 R/w Section 34 of IPC and under section 82 of Registration Act.
Maximum punishment prescribed	up to 7 years of imprisonment and a fine

B) Custody and Procedural Compliance :	
Date of Arrest	Anticipatory Bail
Total period of custody undergone	NA

C) Status of Trial :	
State of proceedings (Investigation/ Chargesheet/ Cognizance/ Framing of Charges /Trial)	Anticipatory Bail
Total number of witnesses cited in the charge-sheet	---

D) Criminal Antecedents :	
FIR No. and Police Station	NA
Sections	NA
Status (Pending/Acquitted Convicted)	NA

E) Previous Bail Applications :	
Court	NA
Case No.	NA
Outcome of case	NA

F) Coercive Processes :	
Whether any Non-Bailable Warrant was issued	--
Whether declared a proclaimed offender	--

1 The Anticipatory bail application filed U/Sec.482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by applicant/accused No. 1 Sanmukh Mahadev Chougule who apprehends his arrest in Crime No.624/2026 registered with Mangalwedha Police Station under Section 420, 467, 468, 471 R/w Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (in short IPC) and under section 82 of Registration Act prayed for grant of protection of anticipatory bail.

2. The facts giving rise to the crime disclosed in the report lodged by informant Atul Ashok Shendge that his grandfather Gagannath Sambhaji Kaygude was residing with him in his old age, his agricultural land Gat bearing No. 63/2/B admeasuring 0.80 R and Gat No. 64/1 admeasuring 2 H 0.5 R situated at Ganeshwadi, Tq. Karjat, Dist. Ahilyanagar. Due to old age Jagannath died on 19.06.2025.

3. The case of informant is that after death his grandfather they made inquiry with Collector Office of acquisition proceeding of the agricultural land of Jagannath, that time it came to knowledge of his family that some one had executed the sale deed of property of Gat No. 298/1 to the extent of 80 R out of total area 6.88 R. Therefore the certified copy of sale deed was obtained and it came to know that fraud has been played by fabricating the documents of ID proof like Aadhar Card which fake identity photograph of other person than that of the original owner of the property Jagannath.

4. Informant conducting inquiry made report to the police, on its basis it disclosed to him that one Sanmukh Mahadev Chaugule was acquainted with property agent namely Pandurang Pralhad Gaikwad. Said Sanmukh Chaugule had introduced Mallikarjun Dharmanna Songude with Pandurang Pralhad Gaikwad, who developed trust on Pandurang Gaikwad and Sanmukh Chaugule as Pandurang had already made one property deal

of brother of Sanmukh. Therefore, Mallikarjun had got the sale deed executed in the name of his son Shivkumar. It is alleged that at the time of execution of sale deed Pandurang Gaikwad, Namdev Kale, Papu Dathil, Sudam Kaygude, Sanmukh Chaugule and Mallikarjun Somgunde had brought a persons with fake identity and ID proof and told them that Jagannath Sambhaji Kaygude is the original owner of the property and the person through which impersonation of Jagannath was pretended also had Aadhar Card. Further all other witnesses were brought by them.

5. It is the case of the informant that the deal of transaction of sale deed was done by Mallikarjun with Somnath and Pandurang for Rs. 6,70,000/-. It was paid in cash to them and Mallikarjun had also transferred Rs. 3,50,000/- in the account of Pandurang. In back ground of this fact on allegations of fake identity and fabricated documents fraud of execution of sale deed by a person not being the owner of the property was effected and the accused persons was involved in the crime.

6. The applicant arrayed as an accused No. 1 in the crime prayed for grant of bail on the ground that he is innocent and having no nexus with the crime. The Ld. Advocate for M. S. Thobade in reference to the contention of application specifically argude that role of the present applicant is limited to the introduction of Mallikarjun with Pandurang because of his brother had acquired landed property through Pandurang Gaikwad and there is no reason for applicant/accused to involved in the alleged offence as he was neither present on the spot at the time of execution of registered sale deed nor was party or witness to this sale deed. That the applicant/accused is teacher by profession and he had no nexus with the crime and had not received any amount of consideration as alleged. Hence, he is entitled for the relief of anticipatory bail as prayed.

7. Say filed by prosecution and police machinery, so also original informant. The Investigating Officer has specifically pointed out that fraud has been played by accused persons in collusion of sale transaction of immovable property to extent Rs. 10,20,000/-, out of Rs. 3,50,000/- has been transferred to the bank account of accused No. 3 who had disclosed during interrogation that accused No. 2 had got the fake Aadhar Card made by accused No. 6, who yet to be arrested. That other accused of the crime are absconded.

8. The contention of the application at length of Ld. Advocate M. S. Thobade in favour of protection of liberty of applicant needs consideration from the point of view of facts and circumstances of the crime. On scrutiny of the F.I.R., each event of the crime as developed since beginning as per allegation prima facie make out a strong involvement of present applicant / accused no.1 in the crime committed. Even it is mentioned that, this accused Sanmukh Chougule and other co-accused Pandurang Gaikwad was the person with whom Mallikarjum Somgunde had made a deal of land for Rs. 6.70,000/- and out of which Rs.3,50,000/- were transferred in the bank account of Pandurang.

9. The prima facie circumstances of the crime do not favour the argument of Ld. Adv. M. S. Thobade advanced before this court, even on exclusion of what are the points of opposition in the say of prosecution.

10. The Ld. APP had strongly argued that, the fake identity of land owner Jagannath was prepared by affixing photograph of other person on his Aadhar Card and sale deed was executed. There is every possibility that syndicate is active for such false and fabricated transaction. Accused No. 1 is involved in the many sale transactions of the land effected by Ujani Project. Therefore release of accused No. 1 whose involvement in the crime

is prima facie made out, will hamper fuehrer investigation of crime and he will have an opportunity hamper and tamper the evidence of witnesses. Therefore, Ld. APP strongly opposed the bail application.

11. Read application, say filed, heard both side. The facts of the crime are complex, certainly made out the involvement applicant/accused No. 1 and other co-accused in the serious nature of crime affecting the valuable rights of the original owner and through him legal heirs entitled for the property in question, whose sale deed got executed by a fake person pretending himself the original owner of the property. The registered sale deed was executed for which identity proof like Aadhar Card which were fake and fabricated.

12. The details of the FIR if scrutinized prima facie made out involvement of each accused including the present applicant in collusion with other co-accused to defraud the original owner of the property. The transfer of cash amount and bank transaction are itself sufficient to make out role of the accused in the crime. Therefore, I am agree with the Ld. APP that there is every possibility of act of syndicate giving rise to such crime must be deal with iron hand and cannot be in casual with just because of applicant has right to claim protection of his liberty.

13. In this back drop, no merits exists in the bail application. Therefore the following order.

ORDER

1 The bail application No.496/2026 stands rejected.

Date : 10.08.2026

(Smt. T. G. Mitkari)
Additional Sessions Judge, Pandharpur