

MHSO010016692026



**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE SOLAPUR,  
AT SOLAPUR**

**CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 596/2026**

Annasaheb Dagadu Metkari,  
Age: 42 years, Occu.  
R/o.Near Sangola, Akluj Road,  
Shivane, District Solapur ... Applicant

**Versus**

The State of Maharashtra ... Non Applicant

**ORDER BELOW (EXHIBIT No.01)  
(06/07/2026)**

1. Heard learned advocate Mr. Auti, for the applicant and learned APP Shri. P. S. Jannu, for the State.
2. Present application is filed by the applicant for grant of anticipatory bail in regard to the offences punishable under Sections 7 and 12 of Prevention of Corruption Act, registered vide C.R. No.378/2026 at Jail Road Police Station, Solapur.
3. It is the case of the prosecution that, on 19.06.2026 complainant lodged complaint against applicant and co-accused

demanded bribe from the complainant. It is contended that bribe of Rs.1,000/- for the co-accused No.1, bribe amount of Rs.4,000/- for applicant and bribe amount of Rs.1,000/- for accused No.3 were demanded, out of which Rs.1,000/- was previously accepted under pretext to sanction withdrawl of Rs.5,00,000/- from the provident fund account. The verification was conducted and trap was laid. During trap the co-accused Barbole accepted the balance bribe amount from the complainant. On the basis of report lodged crime came to be registered against the applicant and co-accused.

4. Learned Adv. Shri. Auti for the applicant submitted that the applicant is falsely implicated in the crime. The co-accused Nos.1 and 3 are granted regular bail. The recovery is already done. The demand is required to be verified. The applicant has no concern with the crime. He is ready to abide the conditions imposed and prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Per contra, vide say Exh. 5 learned A.P.P. opposed the anticipatory bail application. He submitted that the role of the applicant is specifically mentioned in the report. The voice sample of the applicant is required to be obtained. He submitted that for investigation about the chats between applicant and co-accused, his mobile is required to be seized. It is required to be investigated that any other accused is involved in the crime and whether applicant had demanded and accepted bribe amount from any

other person. Hence, prayed for rejection of the application.

6. Considering the matter, there are specific allegations against the applicant being involved in the crime. The prosecution wanted to obtain the voice sample of the applicant and also wanted to seize his mobile handset for investigation about chats between the applicant and co-accused. The prosecution wanted to investigate about the involvement of other persons in the crime. Considering that the offence is antisocial, applicant is not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, I proceed to pass following order.

### **ORDER**

1 Criminal Bail Application No.596/2026 is rejected and disposed off.  
(Dictated and pronounced in open Court)

Place : Solapur  
Date : 06/07/2026

(R. J. Katariya)  
Additional Sessions Judge,  
Solapur.

### **CERTIFICATE**

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file Judgment/Order is same word to word as per the original Judgment/Order.

- (a) Name of the Stenographer : S.R.Kore, Stenographer  
G-1
- (b) Court : R. J. Katariya,  
District Judge – 1 & Addl.  
Sessions Judge, Solapur.
- (c) Order dictated by P.O. on 06/07/2026
- (d) Order signed by P.O. on : 06/07/2026
- (e) Order uploaded on : 06/07/2026