

Urmila Ingale

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 371 OF 2017

Rajkumar Chainraj Basantani .. Appellant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra and anr. .. Respondents

Mr. Manish Bohra i/b A.S.Khan & Associates, for the Appellant.
Mrs.G.P. Mulekar, APP for State.

**CORAM : SMT. V.K.TAHILRAMANI &
M.S.KARNIK, JJ.**

26th APRIL, 2017

ORAL ORDER (PER SMT. V.K.TAHILRAMANI) :

1. This Appeal has been preferred by the appellant who is original accused No.3 in M.P.I.D. Special Case No. 12 of 2005. This Appeal is directed against the order dated 15/03/2017 passed by the learned Special Judge, M.P.I.D. and Additional Sessions Judge Mumbai.

2. It appears to be the case of the prosecution that the appellant transferred the property which was about to be

attached to one Ajit Kumar Tahiliani for consideration. By the impugned order, the appellant was directed to deposit all the consideration amount which he received from and out of the sale of the said property which was about to be attached or which is liable for attachment. The order further states that amount to be deposited within a period of 60 days from the date of the order and if the amount is not deposited in the stipulated period of 60 days, a show cause notice will be issued to the appellant as to why his bail order should not be cancelled and why he should not be taken into custody.

3. As of now, the appellant has almost 3 weeks in which he can deposit the amount. In case the appellant does not deposit the amount within the stipulated period, a show cause notice would be issued to the appellant. If such a show cause notice is issued to the appellant, the appellant shall be granted 4 weeks time to reply to the show cause notice. Till then no action shall be taken against the appellant. We are of the opinion that the above order would sufficiently protect the

appellant and no further orders are necessary.

4. Appeal is disposed of in the above terms.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)

(SMT. V.K.TAHILRAMANI, J.)