

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

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2291 OF 2016

Mrs. Sarojdevi Gulzari Singh

.. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

.. Respondent

Mr. Shekhar Bhujbal, Advocate for the Applicant.

Smt. J.S. Lohokare, A.P.P for the Respondent - State.

Mr. Jagdish Shinde, Police Inspector, Mira Road Police Station, present.

CORAM : N.W. SAMBRE, J.

DATED : 22nd NOVEMBER, 2016.

P.C. :

1 The applicant is seeking regular bail in Crime No.157 of 2016, for the offences punishable under Sections 372, 373, 376 r/w. 34 of the I.P.C., Sections 4, 5, 6 and 8 of the PITA and Sections 4 and 8 of the POCSO Act.

2 The learned counsel for the applicant strenuously urge that looking to the age of the applicant, absence of criminal antecedents, completion of investigation as the charge sheet is filed, the applicant is entitled to be released. According to him, there is hardly any material on the record to connect the applicant to the crime in question.

3 The learned A.P.P. opposed the application on the ground that there is sufficient material including that of the statement of the victim available on the record so as to connect the applicant to the crime in question.

4 Apart from above, the A.P.P. submits that the investigation in the matter is still going on as some of the accused namely, Jeetu Singh and Gudiya Singh were also related and known to the applicant are absconding.

5 Having bestowed my thoughts to the submissions made it is required to be observed here that there is enough material on the record to infer prima facie involvement of the applicant in the crime in question.

6 Apart from above, it appears that the applicant herself and her other members / her daughter were in the same business of prostitution and appears to be in habit of using the girls from the village for higher financial returns in Bombay and forced them to enter in the professional prostitution.

7 The applicant is also booked under the provisions of PITA and POCSO act as the girls at the relevant time were minor. In this view of the matter, there is no case is made out.

8 The application is rejected.

(N.W. SAMBRE, J.)