IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Anticipatory Bail Application No.27 of 2026

Sangita Ravindra Mehendale
Age: 56 years, Occ: None,
Indian Inhabitant,
having address at 26, Yashree,
Nirmal Baug Society,
Shivdarshan, Parvati Pune … Applicant
versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
   Through Public Prosecutor,
   High Court of Judicature at Bombay.

2. The Sr. Police Inspector,
   Deccan Police Station, Pune

3. Prasad Vasudev Pranjpe
2nd Floor, Chandrama Apartments,
Prabhat Road, Deccan, Pune … Respondents

With

Interim Application (Stamp) No.7764 of 2026

In

Anticipatory Bail Application No.27 of 2026

Prasad Vasudev Pranajpe
Age: 59 years, Occ: Business,
Residing at-2nd Floor,
Chandrama Apartments,
Prabhat Road, Deccan, Pune … Intervenor/Informant.

In the matter between:
Sangita Ravindra Mehendale
Age: 45 years, Occ: Business,

R/at - Yashree, Nirmal Baug Society,
Sahakar Nagar, Pune … Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
(Through Deccan Police Station,
vide CR No.177/2025) … Respondent.

With

Anticipatory Bail Application No.29 of 2026

Saurabh Ravindra Mehendale
Age: 30 years, Occ: None,
Indian Inhabitant,
having address at 26, Yashree,
Nirmal Baug Society,
Shivdarshan, Parvati Pune … Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
   Through Public Prosecutor,
   High Court of Judicature at Bombay.

2. The Sr. Police Inspector,
   Deccan Police Station, Pune

3. Prasad Vasudev Pranajpe
2nd Floor, Chandrama Apartments,
Prabhat Road, Deccan, Pune … Respondents

With

Interim Application (Stamp) No.7765 of 2026

In

Anticipatory Bail Application No.29 of 2026

Prasad Vasudev Pranajpe
Age: 59 years, Occ: Business,
Residing at-2nd Floor,
Chandrama Apartments,
Prabhat Road, Deccan, Pune … Intervenor/ Informant.

In the matter between:
Saurabh Ravindra Mehendale
Age: 45 years, Occ: Business,
R/at Yashree, Nirmal Baug Society,
Sahakar Nagar Pune … Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra
(Through Deccan Police Station,
vide CR No.177/2025) … Respondent.

With

Anticipatory Bail Application No.26 of 2026

Ravindra Yashwant Mehendale
Age: 62 years, Occ: None,
Indian Inhabitant,
having address at 26, Yashree,
Nirmal Baug Society,
Shivdarshan, Parvati Pune … Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
   Through Public Prosecutor,
   High Court of Judicature at Bombay.

2. The Sr. Police Inspector,
   Deccan Police Station, Pune

3. Prasad Vasudev Pranajpe
2nd Floor, Chandrama Apartments,
Prabhat Road, Deccan, Pune. … Respondents

With

Interim Application (Stamp) No.7749 of 2026

In

Anticipatory Bail Application No.26 of 2026

Prasad Vasudev Pranajpe
Age: 59 years, Occ: Business,
Residing at-2nd Floor,
Chandrama Apartments,
Prabhat Road, Deccan, Pune … Intervenor/Informant.

In the matter between:
Ravindra Yashwant Mehendale
Age: 45 years, Occ: Business,
R/at- Yashree, Nirmal Baug Society,
Sahakar Nagar, Pune … Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
(Through Deccan Police Station,
vide CR No.177 of 2025) … Respondents

Mr Shivraj Kuncharge, a/w. Mr Parmeshwar Bhise, for the applicants in all ABAs.
Mr Nagesh Khedkar, for the intervenor in all IAs.
Ms Anagha A Deshmukh, APP, for the respondent/ State.
PSI AB Patil, Deccan Police Station, Pune City, is present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.
Date: 15 April 2026.

P.C.:

Heard learned Counsel for the parties.

2. For the reasons stated in the interim applications, and no objection from the other side, the interim applications are allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a). The applicants in anticipatory bail applications to implead the intervenor in respective applications as a party respondent to these applications. Necessary amendment shall be carried out forthwith.

3. The interim applications stand disposed of accordingly.

<u>ABA Nos.27 of 2026 a/w 29 of 2026 and 26 of 2026 :</u>

By these applications, the applicants seek pre-arrest bail in connection with CR No.177 of 2025, registered at Deccan Police Station, Pune, for offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(2) r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

2. Heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants, the learned Counsel for the intervenor/respondent No.2, and the learned APP representing respondent/State.

3. The prosecution's case, in brief, is that the informant came in contact with the applicant Ravindra Mehandale in the year

2021. Applicant Ravindra is the husband of applicant Sangita and the father of applicant Saurabh. The applicants represented that they were capable of arranging substantial loans through certain entities and persons, and on such representation, induced the informant and others to part with a sum of Rs.57,66,200/- towards margin money for procuring a loan of Rs.10 Crore. Despite receipt of the said amount, the applicants failed to secure the loan. It is further alleged that upon demand, the applicants issued cheques amounting to Rs.1,25,00,000/-, which, on presentation, were dishonoured.

4. Learned Counsel for the applicants submitted that the applicants are falsely implicated; that there is a delay in lodging the FIR; and that the dispute is essentially civil in nature, arising out of a financial transaction, for which appropriate civil remedies are available. It is contended that the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are not made out.

5. Learned APP opposed the application, submitting that the applicants induced the informant and others to part with a substantial amount under the pretext of securing a loan and failed to fulfil their assurances. It is further submitted that similar complaints have been lodged against the applicants, indicating a pattern of conduct. The investigation is at a nascent stage, and custodial interrogation is necessary for the recovery

of the amount and for unearthing the full extent of the offence.

6. Upon consideration of the material on record, this Court finds that prima facie, the allegations disclose that the applicants, by making representations and assurances of securing a loan, induced the informant to part with a substantial amount of Rs.57,66,200/-. The subsequent conduct of issuing cheques which were dishonoured lends support to the prosecution's case at this stage. The sequence of events, as alleged, cannot be said to be a mere breach of contract or civil dispute. The element of inducement and dishonest intention, prima facie, appears to be present from the inception. The contention regarding the delay in lodging the FIR, at this stage, does not dilute the gravity of the allegations, particularly when the transactions appear to be continuous and assurances were allegedly given from time to time.

7. The material placed on record further indicates that similar complaints have been made against the applicants. The possibility of multiple victims and a larger conspiracy cannot be ruled out at this stage. The investigation is admittedly at a nascent stage, and an effective investigation would require custodial interrogation of the applicants, *inter alia*, for recovery of the amount and for ascertaining the involvement of other persons. Grant of anticipatory bail, in the facts of the present

case, is likely to impede the course of investigation. In cases of this nature, the custodial interrogation becomes essential to unearth the fraud in all its facets and have the money trail. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the amount involved, and the *prima facie* material indicating dishonest intention, this Court is not inclined to exercise its discretion in favour of the applicants.

8. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail applications stand rejected.

[R.N. Laddha, J.]