

Anand

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

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1980 OF 2017

Narayan Bhadridas Vaishnav	.Applicant
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra	.Respondent

**WITH
BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2307 OF 2017**

Prakash Ranchhod Divakar	.Applicant
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra	.Respondent

Mr. M. Chandanshiv i/b. Mr. P. Y. Kulkarni, Advocate, for the Applicant
in **B. A. No. 1980 of 2017**

Mr. Satyavrat Joshi, Advocate, for the Applicant in **B. A. No. 2307 of 2017**

Mr. S. H. Yadav, APP, for the Respondent – State in **B. A. No. 1980 of 2017**

Mr. Rajan Salvi, APP, for the Respondent – State in **B. A. No. 2307 of 2017**

CORAM : A.S.GADKARI, J.

DATE : 09.11.2017

P.C.

. These are the applications under Section 439 of Cr. P.C. for bail in CR No. 283 of 2016 registered with Wanwadi Police Station, Pune under Sections 364A, 504, 506(1) r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. It is the prosecution case that the Applicant – Narayan was working as an employee with Purshottam Rathi, the father of victim.

That on 27.06.2016 at about 8.45 p.m., the Applicant – Prakash alongwith other accused persons abducted victim – Ankit Rathi and thereafter, initially demanded a sum of Rs. 3,00,00,000/- from the father of Ankit Rathi namely Purshottam Rathi and subsequently, settled their demand to Rs. 30,00,000/-. That when accused Nos. 1 to 5 came at the spot to collect the said ransom, the police apprehended them. During the course of investigation, it is revealed that the Applicant – Narayan who was an employee with the father of victim namely Purshottam Rathi is the master mind behind the said crime. After completion of investigation, police have submitted charge-sheet.

3. Perused the charge-sheet. It is to be noted here that, the Applicant – Prakash was apprehended by the police on the spot while accepting the ransom amount. During the course of investigation, it is revealed that the Applicant – Narayan has hatched the said plan to abduct/kidnap victim – Ankit and to demand the said ransom from his father as Applicant – Narayan was well aware about the financial condition of the victim. There is sufficient material on record to show the complicity of the Applicants.

4. In view of the above, the Applications are accordingly rejected.

(A.S.GADKARI, J.)