



**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE
AT PANVEL, DISTRICT- RAIGAD**

Criminal Bail Application No. 682/2026

Mojhes Alayza Jacob @ Korlekar	--Applicant
Vs.	
State of Maharashtra	--- Opponent

Appearance-

Ld. Advocate Shri. S. A. Mhatre for applicant

Ld. Addl.PP. Shri. Rajendra Yerunkar for opponent.

ORDER BELOW EXH. 1

1. This is an application filed by applicant **Mojhes Alayza Jacob @ Korlekar** under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (in short "BNSS") for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. I.O. has filed say to this application at Exh.7 and thereby strongly opposed the application.
3. Perused application, say thereon and documents produced on the record. Notice of the bail application was issued to the informant. Accordingly, informant appeared and strongly opposed the bail application. Heard both sides.

4. Ld. Advocate for applicant submitted that, the applicant is innocent. He is not concerned with alleged offence. The applicant is retired Administrative Officer. After retirement, he engaged in social activities. He is managing trustee/secretary of Beth EL Synagogue Trust in Panvel, Navi Mumbai. The said trust is for protecting the property of persons belonging to Israel (Jewish religion). The informant came to know that the sale deed was executed by impersonating the original owners in respect of survey No.81/2, village Karanjade, Tal. Panvel. Therefore, the applicant filed complaint to Panvel police station and other Government Department. On behalf of the trust notice was sent to informant Prashant Patekar. However, the informant replied the said notice mentioning that the owners are genuine. Thereafter, the trust had called legal-heirs of original owners. The FIR was registered. Hence, the applicant withdrawn the said complaint. The legal-heirs of original owners authorized the informant to lodge complaint. On the contrary, the legal-heirs filed complaint against the informant. There is no dishonest intention on the part of the applicant. Applicant is ready to co-operate investigating agency. Custodial interrogation is not necessary.
5. Ld. Addl.PP Shri. Rajendra Yerunkar submitted that, the offence is of serious in nature. The applicant was aware

that the original owners of the involved property were not available for sale. There was deep rooted conspiracy between the applicant and others. The sale deed was executed in favour of the informant by impersonating the original owners. The applicant and co-accused Aslam Munshi had received rupees one crore from co-accused Suraj Shinde out of the sale proceeds. It is necessary to verify whether any other persons are involved in the commission of the crime. It is also necessary to obtain information from where forged Aadhar Card, Pan cards were prepared. Considering nature and gravity of the offence deep investigation of the crime is necessary. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the present applicant is necessary. Hence, prosecution prayed for rejection of anticipatory bail.

6. Perused FIR and documents placed on record. Informant Prashant Prabhakar Patekar is engaged in construction business and was looking for land for development. Agent Amrut Maruti Thakur informed the informant that Survey No. 81/2, admeasuring 47R, Mauje Karanjade, Tal. Panvel, District-Raigad is available for sale. Relevant documents were available with agent Suraj Vasudev Shinde. The informant verified the said documents and also investigated the title through his Advocate. Thereafter, meeting of the informant was held with

Nathan Eliyahoo Chincholkar and Shalom (Selim) Eliyahoo Chincholkar and their agent Suraj Shinde and Amrut Thakur. Informant agreed to purchase the said property for consideration of Rs.2,35,00,000/-. Thereafter, sale deed was executed in favour of the informant on 23/08/2024. Informant paid Rs.2,29,50,000/-. Thereafter, Mr. Mojhes Alayza Jacob @ Korlekar trustee of Beth EL Synagogue Trust, Panvel, Navi Mumbai through Aslam Munshi lodged complaint in Panvel City Police Station that sale deed was executed by impersonating the original owners. After some days Mr. Korlekar had withdrawn the said complaint. Therefore, informant paid balance amount Rs.34,00,000/- believing that sellers are true. Thereafter, original owners Shalom (Selim) Eliyahoo Chincholkar's legal-heirs through power of attorney Shri. Orion Mojhes Penkar issued notice to the informant on 18/08/2025 stating that sale deed was executed by impersonating original owners. Informant contacted agent Suraj Shinde. At that time, Suraj Shinde had given assurance to the informant that sellers are genuine. The informant came to know that original owner Nathan Chincholkar and Shalom (Selim) Chincholkar were migrated to Israel country and they died there in 2011 and 2016 respectively. Their legal-heirs are settled in Israel and America. Shalom (Selim) Chincholkar's son

Bechalel Shalom (Selim) Chincholkar had authorised Shri Orion Penkar by power of attorney. Nathan Chincholkar's son Imail Nathan Bezanmin @ Chincholkar and Imail's wife Dezee were also present for investigation. After discussion with them, informant came to know that sale deed was executed in his favour by impersonators. The informant realized that he has been cheated. Therefore, informant lodged report with Panvel City police station vide CR.No.113/2026 for the offences punishable under Section 340(2), 340, 339, 338, 337, 336, 335, 319, 318(4) read with 3(5) of the BNS.

7. During investigation it is revealed that Nathan Eliyahoo Chincholkar and Shalom (Selim) Chincholkar were owner of Survey No.81/2 admeasuring area 47 Gunthas. They were migrated to Israel country and died there in 2011 and 2016 respectively. Their legal-heirs are also settled in Israel and America. Applicant being trustee of Beth EL Synagogue Trust, Panvel, Navi Mumbai is taking care of the property involved in the question. On 21/03/2012, there was transaction regarding the said property between Gurunath Bhagat and Smt. Ulka Dhuri with Nissim Nathan Chincholkar through applicant for Rs.50,00,000/-. Out of the said amount Gurunath Bhagat and Ulka Dhuri each had paid Rs.1,00,000/- i.e. total (Rs.2,00,000/-) and accordingly *Bayana Pavati* was

executed. Nissim Chincholkar had given authority letter to Gurunath Bhagat for completing the said transaction. The Aslam was informed about the said transaction. Therefore, the Aslam had shown his willingness to purchase the said property. Agreed consideration was Rs.70,50,000/- for the half share of Gurunath Bhagat. The Aslam paid certain amount. Therefore, *Bayana Pavati* was written in his favour. Gurunath Bhagat informed agent Suraj Shinde that the original owners of the said property are staying in Israel and America and also informed about the transaction with Gurunath Bhagat. All the documents were available with applicant. He was knowing that the owner of the said property are staying outside India. He knew about all the details of the property. He was also aware that the original owners Nathan and Shalom were dead. Their heirs are staying in Israel and America. In spite of this property was sold to the informant by impersonating the deceased original owners. There was discussion between the applicant and co-accused that the applicant, Gurunath Bhagat and Aslam Munshi would get 50% shares out of the sale proceeds. It is further revealed that applicant filed complaint in Panvel City Police Station to create pressure upon co-accused Suraj Shinde and Vasudev Shinde to get their shares out of the sale proceeds. Thereafter, applicant had given power of

attorney to Aslam. Applicant and co-accused Aslam received rupees one crore from co-accused Suraj Shinde and Vasudev Shinde. The said amount was withdrawn from the account of impersonator after sale deed. After getting rupees one crore, Aslam Munshi being authorized person of the applicant had withdrawn the complaint.

8. Prima facie it seems that, the applicant was party to the conspiracy since beginning. There was active involvement of the present applicant in the commission of the crime. The investigation is initial stage. The offence is of economic nature. If the applicant is released on anticipatory bail, it would hamper the investigation of the case. Therefore, considering the role attributed to the present applicant, the custodial interrogation is necessary. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail. Hence, I proceed to pass following order.

:: ORDER ::

1. Application (Exh.1) is rejected.
2. Informed the concerned police station, accordingly.

Panvel,
Dated :- 14/08/2026

(S. R. Chavan)
Addl. Sessions Judge
Panvel, Dist.-Raigad