

Ajay

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2413 OF 2026

Chandrakant Ramchandra Sanglikar

.. Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Anr.

.. Respondents

.....

- Mr. Niranjan Mundargi a/w. Ms. Keral Mehta, Mr. Shailesh Kharat, Kanish Waghware, Ms. Shalini Jaiswal, Advocates i/by Ajay S. Jaiswal for Applicant.
- Mr. Sukanta A. Karmakar, APP for Respondent No.2 – State.
- Mr. Rajiv Chavan, Senior Advocate a/w. Mr. Rohan Mahadik, Mr. Sunil Lahane, Ms. Mekhala More, Ms. Sonam Pandey, Ms. Asmi Desai, Ms. Siddhi Bhutada and Ms. Anjali Khapare, Advocates for Respondent No.2.
- API – Mr. Sachin Ghate, EOW, Pimpri Chinchwad present.

.....

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : SEPTEMBER 02, 2026.

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Mundargi, learned Advocate for Applicant; Mr. Karmakar, learned APP for Respondent No.1 – State and Mr. Chavan, learned Senior Advocate for Respondent No.2.

2. This is an Application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking bail. The case of Applicant is for enlargement on bail in First Information Report (FIR) No.475 of 2025 dated 18.10.2025 registered with Bavdhan Police Station for offences punishable under Sections 409, 420, 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC').

3. According to the prosecution case, Applicant had absolute knowledge about the right and entitlement of PACL, the Company which had invested and purchased the subject lands claimed to be belonging to the Applicant and notwithstanding that the Applicant dealt with the same pursuant to 2016 / 2017.

4. In so far as Applicant's case, which *prima facie* emanates from the record is concerned, the Applicant was a Director of two Companies called 'Crest Entertainment & Media Pvt. Ltd.' and 'W.S. Infra Pvt. Ltd.' and in the name of these Companies, land parcels were purchased by following the due process of law by the said Companies in the year 2011 in various Gat Numbers of which there is no dispute.

5. The prosecution case stems from the fact that the Company called PACL had invested substantial amounts and was the purchaser of these very land parcels in altogether separate transactions. Therefore, between 2017 and 2023, in view of the proceedings which were initiated and which ultimately went up to the Supreme Court, an embargo was imposed by the Supreme Court in 2016 pursuant to the directions passed after evaluating the Lodha Committee report in September 2023. Though the Supreme Court passed a direction on 02.02.2016, the embargo with regard to dealing with the subject land in the revenue record was mutated in Revenue Record only in September 2023. The transactions of the Company were in the year

2017 and therefore though Mr. Chavan has made a valiant effort to persuade me to consider that the Applicant had knowledge of the said embargo. I am however unable to accept the same at this stage. Undoubtedly, whether the Applicant was complicit in the offence and had knowledge thereof will be proved at trial.

6. With regard to receipt of moneys, the prosecution as well as Mr. Chavan has persuaded me to consider that the prosecution has prepared chart appended at Page No.66 which shows the amounts received by the Applicant's Companies from the four investors/purchasers which is to the tune of approximately Rs.3.33 crores.

7. Mr. Chavan, in his usual fairness has placed before the Court the money trail unearthed by the prosecution on the basis of the bank account statements of the Companies which had received the aforesaid amount and the same *prima facie* show receipt of the said moneys from the said investors/purchasers. Though the said issue has been argued before me and the Court has been urged to impose a condition for deposit of the said amount if the Court is inclined to release the Applicant on bail, the prosecution in its own wisdom is undoubtedly bound to unearth the properties of the Applicant and take appropriate steps as may be available to it in law. I am not inclined to consider the condition of deposit for grant of bail.

8. In so far as the hearing of the Bail Application is concerned *qua* the role of the Applicant as a Director in the Companies concerned and he being the Managing Director of the said Companies, in view of the order passed on 31.08.2026 in the companion/similarly placed Bail Application No.1883 of 2026 which covers the facts of the Applicant's case as well, I am inclined to allow the present Bail Application and release the Applicant on bail.

9. Hence, in view of above *prima facie* observations and finding, Bail Application of Applicant is allowed subject to the following terms and conditions:-

- (i) Applicant – Chandrakant Ramchandra Sanglikar is directed to be immediately released from prison in connection with FIR No.475 of 2025;
- (ii) Applicant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing P.R. Bond of Rs.50,000/- (Rs. Fifty Thousand only) with one or more sureties of the like amount;
- (iii) Applicant shall report to the Investigating Officer at Bhavdhan Police Station, once every week, on the Monday between 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. until commencement of trial and thereafter shall attend all dates of hearing before the Trial Court;
- (iv) Applicant shall cooperate with the conduct of the trial

and remain present before the Trial Court on all dates, unless specifically exempted. Applicant shall not seek unnecessary adjournments. Any such conduct shall entitle the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail;

- (v) Applicant shall not deal with PACL properties or subject properties directly or indirectly in future;
- (vi) Applicant shall not create any third party rights in property forming part of the present prosecution;
- (vii) Applicant shall not influence any of the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner;
- (viii) Applicant shall keep the Investigating Officer informed of their current residential address and mobile telephone number and shall forthwith inform the Investigating Officer of any change in their residential address or mobile telephone number, as and when such change occurs;
- (ix) Applicant shall surrender his passport and shall not travel abroad without permission of the Trial Court; and
- (x) Any breach or infraction of any of the aforesaid conditions shall entail cancellation of the bail granted to the Applicant.

10. It is clarified that the observations made in this order are limited for the purpose of granting bail only and I have not made any observations on merits of the case. The trial shall be adjudicated on the strength of the evidence led and strictly on its own merits being uninfluenced with any of the *prima facie* observations made hereinabove in this order.

11. Bail Application is allowed and disposed in the above terms.

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]

Ajay

AJAY
TRAMBAK
UGALMUGALE
Digitally
signed by AJAY
TRAMBAK
UGALMUGALE
Date:
2026.09.02
15:20:02
+0530