



Cri. Bail Application No.143/2026

(CNR No.: MHPU14-000342-2026)

Ashok Baburao Jadhav

Vs.

State of Maharashtra through

Baramati Taluka Police Station, Dist. Pune

ORDER BELOW EXH. 1

1. The applicant/accused No.1 **Ashok Baburao Jadhav** has moved this application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 as he is apprehending his arrest on an accusation in Crime No. **46/2026** for the offences punishable under Section **318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2), 3(5)** of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered with Baramati Taluka Police Station, Dist. Pune.

2. **The allegations in the FIR are summarized as under:**

The informant Vijayanand Petkar is Executive Officer in Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation, Division – Baramati since last one and half year. On 08/11/2024 informant received letter from his superior from the office of Mumbai for verification of documents of accused no.1 Ashok Bapurao Jadhav and verification of documents of accused no.2 Shivaji Shankar Solnake. Therefore, for verification of their documents he has called the information from the concern School Authorities, on which he came to know that both these accused fabricated the documents and submitted such fabricated documents as genuine with an intention to cheat the Government of Maharashtra. The report in that regard was submitted to M.I.D.C. Division Mumbai. Then as per directions received from M.I.D.C. office Mumbai, services of both accused have been terminated and he also lodged complaint against both accused for fabricating those documents.

On the basis of said complaint, above referred FIR has been registered against both accused.

3. The applicant/accused No. 1 apprehending his arrest therefore, filed this application for grant of anticipatory bail on the grounds raised in his application.

4. The prosecution has strongly resisted the application by filing its reply at **Exh.5**. Contents in it are nothing but replica of contents of FIR. Lastly, urged for rejecting the application.

5. Heard arguments of both sides. The Learned counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that, the applicant/accused has rendered continuous service of 34 years in the office of M.I.D.C., Baramati on contractual basis. Approximately such 342 contractual employees filed Writ Petition before the Hon'ble High Court for permanency of services. Thereafter, the applicant/accused was appointed as permanent employee. Certain documents were called from him by his office, accordingly he submitted the documents. There is overwriting in the school leaving certificate of this applicant/accused no.1, on that basis above referred complaint has been lodged. Considering nature of offence, no personal interrogation is required. Investigation is based on documentary evidence. There are no criminal antecedents against applicant/accused no.1. He is ready to obey the conditions. Hence, he urged for granting anticipatory bail.

6. The learned counsel for applicant/accused placed his reliance on decision in case of **Monirul Hussain Vs. State of Assam**,

AIR Online 2018, Gau 141.

7. The learned A.P.P. submitted that, offence is serious one. The accused fabricated the documents and secured employment in the office of M.I.D.C. Baramati, knowing fully well that, the documents are fabricated and cheated the Government of Maharashtra. He has deprived genuine candidate from securing services. Unless and until he is personally interrogated, it is not possible to collect material, who has given helping hand to this accused in fabricating the document. Who has fabricated the documents is to be traced out. Handwriting of accused is required to be obtained. Thus, as per his submission considering nature and gravity of the offence, applicant/accused is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

8. On hearing submissions of both sides, I have evaluated copy of FIR. I also gone through the reply filed by prosecution at Exh.5 and also other documents placed by the prosecution. I also gone through the documents placed on record by the applicant/accused. At this stage, prima-facie it reveals that, the School Leaving Certificate in the name of applicant/accused has been fabricated by making corrections in the birth of date. The concern school authority has submitted its report to the informant. Not only this but the applicant/accused has used this fabricated document as genuine for securing employment in the Government Department and played fraud upon the government. Hence, detail and thorough investigation is required to be conducted by the investigation agency. Where he has fabricated these documents is to be traced out. In whose hand writing documents have been

fabricated, is to be traced out by the investigation agency. Unless and until he is interrogated personally, the investigation agency will not be able to find out the root of the crime and will not be able to find out whether or not any other person is involved in these illegal activities of fabricating documents.

9. In case of **Monirul Hussain Vs. State of Assam (cited supra)** relied on behalf of accused, Hon'ble Gauhati High Court observed that, allegations made in the FIR does not reflect that, any fabrication or forgery was done by the petitioner himself. It is also apparent that, the petitioner has already retired from service and he was also subjected to disciplinary proceeding for the same. Hence, there is no necessity of custodial interrogation of the petitioner and granted bail.

10. In present case as discussed herein above, the prima-facie material placed on record shows that, this applicant/accused with an intention to secure permanent employment fabricated the document and this fact reflected during verification of documents. Their appears complicity of this accused in this case. Therefore, the ratio laid down in above cited case is not helpful to the applicant/accused in present case. Hence, considering nature and gravity of the offence, this court is of the view that, it is not a fit case to extend benefit of anticipatory bail. In the result, I pass following order.

ORDER

1. The Bail Application No. **143/2026 (Exh.1)** of Applicant/accused No.1 **Ashok Baburao Jadhav**, filed in connection with C.R. No. **46/2026** for the offences punishable

under Section **318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2), 3(5)** of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered with Baramati Taluka Police Station, Dist. Pune, **is rejected.**

2. The bail application is accordingly disposed of.
3. Intimate to the concerned police station accordingly.

Baramati.
Date : 07/03/2026

[B. D. Shelke]
Additional Sessions Judge,
Baramati, Dist. Pune

