

C.B.A. No. 308/2026 : Tanuj Ravindra Saindane Vs. State of
Maharashtra
Order Below Exh.01 (Passed on 06.08.2026)
(CNR No. MHJG080006092026)

1] Applicant Tanuj Ravindra Saindane has filed this application apprehending his arrest in crime No.143/2026, registered under Sections 316(5), 318(4), 336(2)(3), 340(2), 344 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (In short B.N.S.) at City Police Station, Bhusawal.

2] As per police the papers the applicant working as Senior Clerk in Soil and Water Conservation Office, Bhusawal is alleged to have siphoned off the amount of Rs.86,08,643/- between February 2021 to March 2026 from Government Treasury by preparing his excess salary bill than to what he was entitled to and thus, cheated the Government.

3] Heard both sides and perused investigation papers.

4] The learned Counsel for the applicant relied on *Internet copy of the judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Bombay, bench at Nagpur dtd. 31.01.2024 passed in the matter of Hitesh Nachwani Vs. State of Maharashtra* to

argue that there are guidelines in this ruling that when there is misappropriation of Government funds, accused can be enlarged on anticipatory bail if he becomes ready to deposit the misappropriated amount in Treasury. I went through said ruling. Though this ruling is in tone that in case of misappropriation of public fund if the accused is ready to deposit the amount of misappropriation then such permission can be granted so that public money should be back to Government Exchequer, the fact remains that this ruling does not lay down any ratio that anticipatory bail should be granted in every such case.

5] In the case at hand as per FIR only 15 Lakh rupees are deposited by the applicant in Government Treasury. There is misappropriation of huge amount of Rs.86,00,000/-. While exercising discretion for anticipatory bail, nature of offence also must be considered. The offence is very serious. The police report Exh.8 disclosed that, police require the custody of the applicant to know from which computer system he prepared these forged bills from time to time and the computer device so used in this offence. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is also necessary. For all these reasons I am of the opinion that it is most unfit case to grant anticipatory bail.

ORDER

- 1] Application is rejected.
- 2] The interim anticipatory bail order dated 18.06.2026 passed by in-charge Court stands vacated.
- 3] Inform to all concerned.

Date :- 06.08.2026.

(S. B. Hedao)
District Judge-1 &
Additional Sessions Judge,
Bhusawal.