ORDER BELOW EXH. 1

Vinayak Shahinath Parbhane
V/s.
State of Maharashtra

Anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of B.N.S.S. 2023 in Crime No. 2 /2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 420,409,465,467 and 468, read with Section 34 of IPC and 3, 4 and 5 of the MPID Act, 1999 registered at Dharur Police Station, Dist. Beed.

Brief facts of this application and argument of the applicant are

2. That Abbimanyu Laxman Kale, has filed a written complaint on 01-01-2025 at Dharur Police Station. It is alleged that, accused no 1 Sadhana Shahinath Parbhane and 12 others are President/Chariman and other directors of Shri Sairam Urban Multi State Co.Operative Credit Society Ltd. Beed Branch Dharur and they have established the Said Shri Sairam Urban Multi Co-Operative Credit Society and it had branch at Dharur. It is further alleged in that complaint that he had deposited the amount in his savings account at Sadri Multi State Society Ltd. Beed Brach, Dharur. His wife are elderly and are facing financial problems for medical treatment and household expenses. The complainant had repeatedly gone to Shri Sairam Urban Multi State Co-Operative Society Ltd. Beed Branch Dharur to demand the amount deposited in the F.D., Savings account, but the manager and employees there repetadly made fale promises and refused to pay the amount and interest on

the saving accounts. Therefore, the said Shri Sairam Urban Multi State Co-operative Credit Society Ltd. Managers and the promoters, chairman , board of directors and employees responsible for running the business are guilty and therefore he has not received the amount deposited in the savings account in the name of the complainant and his wife. On the basis of such a complaint, a case has been registered against the chairman, vice-chairman and board of directors of the said bank. Accordingly, this applicant has filed bail application on the following grounds as he is not a member of Credit society Ltd. This applicant is innocent person and has no knowledge of the matter in question , he has not committed any crime and he has no connection with the case and his nae has not been mentioned anywhere in that complaint or there is no mention of his connection with the crime. Section of the BNS are not applicable in the present crime and M.P.I.D Act are not applicable because there is no complaint of any crime committed against him. More than one year has passed since the complaint was filed in the said case and a complete investigation has been conducted in the case. There is no need for any investigation against him. There is no need of investigation with this applicant. The name of this applicant in not mentioned in this FIR the police are unnecessarily harassing the applicant and are on the verge of arresting him for the said crime and intending to arrest him with intention of unnecessarily harassing him. He is permanent resident of said given address and having movable and immovable properties there. With this request to grant anticipatory bail application.

3. Say of the prosecution at exh –5.

Say and argument of the prosecution :-

4. There is prima-facie evidence against this accused and involvement of this accused in the present crime. Nature of this offence is serious one. As per complaint he has deposited amount in the FD of the said bank and manager and employees of said bank avoided to pay said amount with interest and refused to pay it.

5. This applicant was CEO in the said Sairam Urban Multistate Beed and he was working as CEO in the said bank. His name is involved in the said crime. Total 16 branch of said bank all are closed and there are many offences are lodged against all of them in the Beed District at various police station. These all accused are having involved and participated in the said fraud and illegal activities. Total 9 offences are registered against them and other 2 cases wherein it requires to arrest them for investigation with them. His police custody requires for custodial interrogation. These accused had cheated to the public at large and they misappropriated total amount of Rs. 92,48,92,058.17/- of depositor 47,899 persons.

6. These accused had purchased various properties in the names of their relatives and family members. Out of them landed property gat no 96 area 1 H 11.50 purchased by them at Hirapur. And to save it from clutches of seized they have transferred it in the relatives name Mahadev Sadashive

Jaher. Purchased many vehicles and transferred it to another names. They are hidden various properties from investigation. If bail is granted then he will not cooperate to the investigation and create obstacles and will dispose of the immovable properties. IN respect of the Dharur Branch there are 962 depositors and there is fraud of 1,09,65, 103.70 .All they are responsible for the said scam, thereby all they have defrauded to the complainant , his wife and people. This complainant has filed various complaint to the various authorities, like Superintendent of Police, Beed, Police Inspector of Economic Offences Branch Beed and District Collector office,Beed, but not taken any action and has not registered any case against them. Complainant also issued notices to the accused but they refused to accept it. As such all accused number of 1 to 15 had committed fraud. With this request to reject this application.

Reasoning:-

7. As per first point of the argument of the applicant- accused that his name is not mentioned in the FIR is not fact as per record. Considering detail say of the Investigation officer his name is mentioned as accused no 14 shown his designated as CEO in the said bank against whom offence is registered as he was working as CEO of the said Credit society.He is son of the accused no 1 Sadhana -Chairman of said Credit society and accused no 3 Sahinath was director of the said credit society. In the FIR designation as CEO is mentioned as accused no 14. And during investigation it is reveals that

this applicant son of the accused no 1 and 3 was the CEO of the said credit society. Accordingly, this argument is not sustainable.

8. Secondly, considering nature grievous and nature of offence is serious and relating to public money, approximately during investigation it is reveals that there is misappropriation, cheating, fraud and other are relating to the total amount of Rs. 92 Crores and though it was promised and agreed that amount not being return to the depositors.

9. During investigation there are many facts about misappropriation, possess of immovable properties in the names of the relatives and other are reveals , which are requires to be investigated with these accused-applicant. As per allegations there are many offences are registered at various police station about said fraud, cheating, fraud, misappropriation of the deposit amount by all these accused with conspiracy.

10. For all these above purpose police custody of this applicant is requires for custodial interrogation, recovery and other details investigation. And this accused is not entitled to get protection under this provisions.

Hence pass following order.

ORDER

1. Application is rejected.

DISTRICT COURTS MAHARASHTRA

Digitally signed by RAHIMAT KONDEKHAN SHAIKH
Date: 2026.05.29 12:46:18 +0530

Place : Kaij
Date : 29/05/2026.

(**Rahimat K. Shaikh**)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Kaij.

CERTIFICATE

"I affirm that the contents of this PDF file are word to word as per original order."

(V. V. Gulwelkar)
Steno Grade-1

Dictated On	:	29/05/2026
Transcribed on	:	29/05/2026
Checked & signed on	:	29/05/2026