

Amk

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 259 OF 2017

Ashraf Ali Abdul Taher Sayed	.. Applicant
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra & Anr.	.. Respondents

Mr. S. G. Rajput for the Applicant.
Mr. Kamran Shaikh a/w. Mr. Mohsin Shaikh i/b O. A. Siddiqui for Respondent No.2.
Ms. P. P. Shinde, APP for the Respondent-State.
Mr. Arun Thorat, API, Dongri Police Station present.

CORAM : A.S. GADKARI, J.
DATE : 19th APRIL, 2017.

P. C. :

1. By an order dated 05.04.2017, the applicant was granted interim relief. The said interim relief was granted on the basis of statement made by the learned counsel for the applicant, on instructions, that the applicant is conducting his business in the name and style of Aasify Enterprises who is in the business of supply of maid servants and other labours to the Gulf Countries. It was also submitted that the said firm had huge deposit with the Consulate of Saudi Arabia and the amount involved in the present crime i.e. Rs.18,51,000/- can be adjusted from the said deposit and be paid to the complainant. The Investigating Officer had sought time to verify the said fact.

2. Today, the Investigating Officer has produced before me the letter addressed by the Consulate General of Saudi Arabia, Mumbai to

Senior Inspector of Police, Dongri Police Station, Mumbai dated 15.04.2017 wherein it is categorically stated that the accused Ashraf Ali Abdul Taher Syed is making false, frivolous and baseless statement. That, neither the accused Ashraf Ali Abdul Taher Syed nor anyone on his behalf has deposited any money in the office of Consulate of Saudi Arabia in Mumbai till date in this matter. It is further mentioned that had it been so, it would have been certainly mentioned in the aforesaid FIR or would have been informed to the police authority accordingly.

3. In view of the categorical statement made by Shri Abdullah M. DH. Al Mutairi, the acting Consulate General of Saudi Arabia at Mumbai, it is apparently clear that the applicant only with a view to get an interim relief from this Court made a palpably false statement on 05.04.2017.

4. In view thereof, the applicant does not deserve for the discretionary relief of pre-arrest bail.

5. The application is, accordingly, dismissed.

[A. S. GADKARI, J.]