

MHNG010064652026 	Crim. Bail Appln. No. 1634/2026 Sandeep Revnath Jagnale V/s State of Maharashtra
<u>IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,</u> <u>NAGPUR.</u> (Presided over by R. M. Mishra)	
(A) CASE DETAILS	
FIR Number & Date	FIR NO. 783/2023 Date-30/08/2023
Police Station, District & State	Mouda, Dist. Nagpur (M.S)
Sections invoked	Section 120(B),109, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 of BNS 2023, Section 66(d) of IT Act and Section 3 of MPDA Act MPID Act.
Maximum punishment prescribed	Imprisonment of either description for terms of which may extend to 10 years and with fine
(B) CUSTODY & PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE	
Date of Arrest	15/12/2023
Total period of custody undergone	Six Days PCR (15/12/2023 to 20/12/2023) Since 20/12/2023 till today accused is into judicial custody.
(C) STATUS OF TRIAL	
Stage of proceedings	Framing of charges

(Investigation/Chargesheet/Cognizance/Framing of Charge/Trial)	
Total number of witnesses cited in the charge-sheet	Around 350
Number of prosecution witnesses examined	--
(D) CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS	
FIR No., Police Station & Sections	Crime No. 304/2018 Police Station Jalalkheda sections 120-B, 420, 409, 467, 468, 471, 411, 413, 201 IPC, section 66(d) of IT Act and section 3 of MPID Act.
Status (Pending/Acquitted Convicted)	--
(E) PREVIOUS BAIL APPLICATIONS	
Court	Special MPID Court, Nagpur J.M.F.C. Court at Mouda
Case No.	R.C.C. No. 33/2026 at Mouda, Dist.Nagpur.
Outcome of case	Bail application was rejected by Special MPID Court on 26/03/2026 Bail application was rejected by J.M.F.C. Court, Mouda on 25/03/2026

(F) COERCIVE PROCESSES	
Whether any Non-bailable Warrant was issued	--
Whether declared as proclaimed offender	--

<u>Applicant</u> <u>(Accused)</u>	: Sandeep Revnath Jagnale, Aged 45 years, Occ. : Service, R/o. Murmadi, Tehsil Lakhni, Dist. Bhandara, Maharashtra.
Represented by	: Ld. Adv. Shri Vinodkumar Chandrika Singh
<u>Complainant/</u> <u>Prosecution</u>	The State of Maharashtra, Through the Police Station Officer, Police Station Mouda, Dist. Nagpur.
Represented by	Ld. APP Smt. Kalvit & Shri M. M. Patankar for the State

ORDER BELOW EXHIBIT 1

(Passed on this 15th day of July, 2026)

This application is filed by the applicant Sandeep Revnath Jagnale under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS 2023') for grant of bail.

2. In this crime, law has been set into motion at the instance of Ramkrushna Manikrao Nimbalkar and others. As mentioned in FIR, the informant/complainant along with

three others are poor agriculturists having small pieces of lands who used to earn their livelihood by farming and other labour works. On the other hand, accused Ramanrao Bolla is having a warehouse at Gumthala (Mauda) who used to purchase grains in large quantity. The applicant is the grain merchant and also having hotel business at Nayakund. He also owned huge agricultural land. One Roshan Pande working as hotel manager and driver with the applicant was sent towards the complainant and others in the year 2017 to inform that the applicant is engaged in assisting agriculturists in getting compensation from the State on account of losing crop due to natural calamities with further representation that under some sort of scheme the Government has awarded compensation to some agriculturists by issuing cheques and they can also get compensation for which an account is required to be opened in the Corporation Bank. Believing on the representation, complainant Ramkrushna and others got ready to go with him and they were taken to the Corporation Bank, Nagpur in Tata Sumo provided by the applicant. In the way, they were provided tea, snacks etc. Roshan Pande had also caused them to consume liquor while proceeding to Nagpur. When the complainant and other victims reached to the bank, the applicant who was present there with co-accused Ramanrao Bolla represented them that they would be required to open account for getting compensation.

Accordingly, the applicant and concerned bank officials obtained their signatures on some bank papers and thereafter, left them to their respective homes. While returning back, again they were provided veg, non-veg food and liquor by Roshan Pande.

3. It was in the year 2018, the complainant and other victims came to know upon receipt of notice of recovery of outstanding amount that they have been defrauded by the accused persons under the false representation by obtaining their signatures under the guise of opening bank accounts. The complainant also came to know that huge loan amount has been raised by the accused persons in their respective names. They were also falsely assured that the loan amount has been invested in several companies and they would repay entire loan amount together with interest by selling the grains stored in the godown and they would also contest the matters in the Court on their behalf. Accordingly, on being found that they have been defrauded, report came to be lodged in the police station.

4. By this application the applicant has not only challenged the order dated 25/03/2026 passed below Exh.7 by the learned J.M.F.C. Mouda rejecting his bail application in R.C.C. No. 33/2026 but the applicant has further prayed for

his release on bail by invoking the provision of section 483 of the B.N.S.S. 2023. It is contended that the impugned order passed by the learned J.M.F.C. suffers from serious error of law resulting in grave miscarriage of justice. The role attributed to this applicant is merely procedural, ministerial and ancillary in nature arising out of the discharge of official banking functions. It is, therefore, contended that on the ground of parity alone the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail. He was arrested in this crime on 15/12/2023. He was remanded in the police custody till 20/12/2023 and thereafter he was remanded to judicial custody. Investigation in this crime already been completed and charge-sheet is also filed. At present stage of the case is for framing charge. However, there is no substantive progress towards commencement of the trial. There are around 350 witnesses cited in this crime. Therefore there is no likelihood of concluding the trial in near future. There is no material on record to show active participation, dishonest intention or wrongful gain or any criminal conspiracy on the part of this applicant. Moreover, there is no specific overt act on the part of this applicant. At the relevant time, the applicant was working as an Assistant Manager (Scale-I) in the concerned branch of the said bank and he was not vested with any authority whatsoever to sanction or approve loan proposals and the power to sanction, approve and disburse loan was

exclusively vested in higher ranking officials i.e. Branch Manager or Chief Manager. The role of the applicant was strictly limited nature and confined to routine banking functions which were procedural, clerical and ministerial. His duties were restricted in collecting and compiling documents, preparing loan file and place them before concerned banking authority and all these acts were performed strictly under the supervision, control and direction of the Branch Manager. However, while rejecting his bail application the learned Magistrate has placed undue and excessive reliance upon RTGS transactions while arriving at the conclusion of the applicant's alleged involvement. Mere absence of signature on certain RTGS forms is a procedural lapse or deviation from internal banking protocol and it does not amount to an offence. There is no evidence on record to show involvement of the applicant in the conspiracy. In criminal application (CRL) No.1209/2024 the Hon'ble High Court by an order dated 19/12/2025 quashed the offence to the extent of section 411 and 413 of IPC and section 3 of MPID Act, 1999. Therefore, there is change in the circumstances in filing this application. The principal accused persons are already granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, therefore, applicant is also entitled to be released on bill on the ground of parity. The applicant is ready to abide by the conditions imposed by the court, in case of his release on bail. The

applicant, therefore, prayed for his release on bail.

5. Application is resisted by the prosecution vide say (Exh.4) mainly on the ground that during his tenure the applicant has obtained signatures of total 158 victims by misleading them in preparing their loan cases. In all these loan cases, only one person i.e. main accused Ramanrao Bolla has been introduced as guarantor. While recording the statements of number of witnesses under section 161 and 164 of Cr.P.C., it has been transpired that the applicant has been actively participated in committing this offence. Number of cheques and RTGS forms of huge amount of which signatures of victims were obtained are seized in this crime. The applicant is having earlier criminal antecedents to his discredit. Another offence in Crime No.304/2018 is also registered against the applicant in Jalalkheda police station under section 120-B, 420, 409, 467, 468, 471, 411, 413, 201 IPC, section 66(d) of IT Act and section 3 of MPID Act. While conducting the audit report in this crime by the Vigilance Department of the main branch, it has been transpired that the applicant has actively participated in committing this crime. Even if the investigation in this case is completed, assets earned by the accused persons in this crime is still untraceable. In these circumstances, if the applicant is granted bail there is every likelihood of pressurizing or alluring the prosecution witnesses by the applicant as well as

disappearance of evidence by him. It is, therefore, contended that the application is liable to be rejected.

6. In the light of respective submissions, I have carefully gone through the documents filed by the applicant and also considered the attending circumstances on record. It is not in dispute that at the relevant time, the applicant was working as an Assistant Manager in the concerned branch. In this background, if the role of the applicant is taken into consideration, it is apparent on record that the applicant was actively involved in the conspiracy while preparing bogus loan cases of poor victims to the tune of Rs.49,00,000/-. The applicant found engaged in preparing bogus documents of RTGS by showing the same as genuine on the record of the bank. It has been transpired that the applicant in collusion with deceased Manshuram Patil misused the bank deposits by showing the same as agricultural produce loan in the name of poor agriculturists and thereafter, said amount has been transferred in different accounts of main accused. The applicant also found involved in disposing of grains of around 34 loan account to the tune of Rs.16,58,83,400/- which was hypothecated in the bank by hatching conspiracy with other co-accused. He has transferred total amount of Rs.77,78,38,400/- from the Loan account of 158 victims in the account of accused Ramanrao Bolla and

others through bogus RTGS in order to gain unlawfully.

7. It can also be seen from the record that earlier also similar kind of offence in Crime No.304/2018 under section 409 of IPC has been registered against the applicant in Jalalkheda police station. In spite the misappropriated account was appearing transferred in the accounts of Ramanrao Bolla and other in the electronic system of the bank, the applicant along with deceased Manshuram Patil found in transferring the said amount in different accounts.

8. On the basis of statements of number of witnesses recorded under section 161 and 164 of Cr.P.C., it can be seen that the applicant has actively participated in committing this offence by hatching conspiracy with other co-accused. As discussed earlier, the applicant is already having criminal antecedents to his discredit. While considering the ground of parity, no doubt, one of the accused Ramanrao Bolla has been granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by an order dated 26/05/2026 in Cri. Appeal No.2858/2026 @ SLP (CRL) No.18784/2025. However, it reveals that one of the grounds considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court while granting bail to the accused Ramanrao Bolla is that he is suffering from heart ailment and he was admitted in the Government Hospital for more than five months and he was hospitalized

on number of occasions. However, such is not the position of this applicant. On the contrary, it reveals that role of this applicant clearly distinguishable. Being responsible employee of the said bank, it was his duty to bring into notice said illegal activities of other co-accused to the superior officials of the bank. In fact, there is misappropriation of huge amount which is belonging to the public at large. However, as discussed earlier, the applicant has not actively participated but he has also assisted other co-accused in transferring said amount by defrauding poor agriculturists who are victims of the offence. Therefore, in view of these reasons, I am of the considered view that no case is made out by the applicant for grant of bail. Thus, following order is passed :-

ORDER

Application under section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is hereby rejected.

Nagpur.
Dated : 15/07/2026.

(**R. M. Mishra**)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Nagpur.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. File of order are word to word same as per original order.

Name of Stenographer : A. N. Waghmare.