

**FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**BENCH AT AURANGABAD.**  
**APPELLATE SIDE JURISDICTION**

|                                                        |                                          |                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Office Memoranda of appearance, directions and orders. | Notes, of Court's orders and Registrar's | Court's or Judge's orders. |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------|

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.: 177 OF 2015**  
**KRISHNAMURARI S/O RAJENDRA GUPTA**  
**VERSUS**  
**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER**

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Mantri Vipinchandra B.  
APP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2: Mr. N. B. Patil.

\*\*\*

**CORAM: T. V. NALAWADE, J.**  
**DATED: 23rd FEBRUARY, 2015.**

**PER COURT:**

1. This application is filed for bail. Both the sides are heard. This Court has perused the papers of investigation.
2. The previous application bearing No.790 of 2014 was rejected by this Court by order dated 12th March, 2014. On that occasion also, the say of the prosecutrix/ victim girl was taken by this Court and even when she had expressed that she has no grievance against the applicant, the bail was refused.
3. It is the case of the Application that he is the husband of the victim girl. As per the school record and the statements of the parents of the victim girl the age of the prosecutrix was hardly 15 years at the relevant time. Allegations against the applicant are that he used to supply

her on commission basis by saying that she was his girl friend. There are statements of some witnesses, who are not yet examined in the case.

4. The learned counsel for the Applicant submitted that the evidence of the victim girl has been recorded and she has not blamed the present applicant and as such it cannot be said that there is a chance of conviction of the applicant. This submission is not at all acceptable. There is specific allegation against him that he supplied his own wife who was a minor on commission basis to the clients and he virtually dragged her in prostitution. In such circumstance, discretionary relief cannot be given in favour of such a person. Some witnesses will be giving evidence to prove such case.

5. The applicant is from Uttar Pradesh. Bail was refused to him in 2014 and the circumstances have not changed. Even if the evidence of the victim girl is ignored there is possibility of having other evidence and those witnesses are not examined. In such cases there is possibility of abscondence of the accused.

6. In the result, the application is rejected.

**[T. V. NALAWADE, J.]**

Dt.23/02/2015  
ans/177