

nsc.

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1197 OF 2015

Ranjeet Veeren	... Applicant
Vs	
The State of Maharashtra	... Respondent

Mr.K.H.Giri, for the Applicant.
Ms.P.P.Shinde, APP for the Respondent – State.

**CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.
DATE : 25th AUGUST, 2015**

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the Applicant and learned APP for the Respondent - State.

2. By this Application, the Applicant seeks pre-arrest bail, in connection with C.R. No. 160 of 2015, registered with the Chunabhatti Police Station, Mumbai, for the alleged offences punishable under Section 363 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The complainant is the father of the victim who was kidnapped. It is alleged by him in the FIR that his son was forcibly made to sit in the Tavera Car and was kidnapped by some unknown person.

Accordingly, an FIR has been lodged as against the unknown person.

4. Learned Counsel for the Applicant states that the victim and his father were hawkers and were selling cutlery items. He submitted that there was some disputes between the two families i.e. the complainant's family and the applicant's family and on account of the same the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submitted that the perusal of the FIR shows that although the First Informant has witnessed Uttam Shirke being kidnapped, when his second son came to the spot he has not disclosed the said fact to his son – Chandar.

5. Learned APP opposed the application. She submitted that the statement of the owner of the room where the victim was kept after being kidnapped has been recorded

6. Perused the said statement. It appears that the present applicant had taken a room on rent and that the present applicant had come along with the others in a Tavera Car. He has stated that the present applicant

had got a person who was limping and it is alleged by the prosecution that the said person who was limping was the victim – Uttam who was kidnapped.

7. Perused the statement of Uttam. He has alleged that a sum of Rs.7 lacs was demanded from him. Learned APP also submitted that there are two cases which have been registered as against the present applicant one under Section 302 and other under Section 326.

8. Considering the nature of allegations, prima-facie, this is not a fit case for granting pre-arrest bail to the applicant.

9. Hence, the Application for anticipatory bail is rejected and disposed of as such.

10. Needless to observe that the trial court shall decide the case on its own merits uninfluenced by the observations made in this order.

REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.