

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.624/2017

Harmelsingh Ranjitsingh Dangi.vs.State of Maharashtra thr.PSO P.S. Gondpipri, Dist Chandrapur

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. N. A. Chauhan, Advocate for applicant.
Mr. V. Gangane, A.P.P. for non applicant.

CORAM : V.M. DESHPANDE, J.
DATED : AUGUST 31, 2017

Heard Mr. N. A. Chauhan, Advocate for applicant and Mr. V. Gangane, A.P.P. for non applicant.

Though this case is coming for the first time, the learned A.P.P. is ready with the instructions as the investigating officer himself is present in the Court along with all the necessary records.

The learned counsel for the applicant has made a statement that the applicant, at the relevant time, was hospitalized and he was not having conscious possession over the contraband. He submitted that the co-accused Kamla is already released on bail. It appears that Kamla was released on regular bail. Present is the application for pre-arrest bail since the applicant is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.409/2017 registered with Police Station, Gondpipri, District Chandrapur under Section 65 (e) of the Maharashtra Prohibition Act.

The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant is roped in only on the suspicion and there is nothing against the applicant.

The learned A.P.P. on the basis of the police papers submits that during the interrogation, the accused who is released on bail gave the lead about involvement of the present applicant and therefore the investigating officer wants to investigate into the role of the present applicant in the crime in question. He also submitted that the present applicant is having past criminal records. He points out that there are about 10 offences registered against the present applicant and those cases are pending before the competent court and all are registered under the Maharashtra Prohibition Act.

The learned counsel for the applicant submits that all those offences are false offences. However, the learned counsel for the applicant could not reply to the query put to him as to whether at any point of time the applicant has preferred an application before this Court for quashing of these proceedings or has taken any steps against any of the investigating officers for falsely involving him in criminal cases.

In that view of the matter, the applicant is not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail. The application is therefore rejected.

JUDGE