

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

APPLICATION NO.508 OF 2014

Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd. ... **Applicant**

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ... **Respondents**

Mr. Niranjan Mundargi, a/w. Ms. Shona Maitra & Mr. Ahuramaz Postrala,
i/by Wadia Ghandy & Co. for the Applicant.

Mr. R.M. Pethe, APP for Respondent No.1 State.

Mr. Shirish Gupta, Sr. Advocate, i/by Tejas Hilage for Resondent No.2.

CORAM : A.S.GADKARI, J.

DATE : 9th JANUARY 2018

P.C.:

. This is an application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to
respondent No.1 in C.R.No.253/2013 registered with Sahar Police
Station, Mumbai by the learned Additional Sessions Judge for Greater
Bombay in Anticipatory Bail Application No.1407/2013 by its Order
dated 03.07.2014.

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the applicant, learned Counsel for
respondent No.2 and the learned APP. Perused the record.

3. The Authorized Officer of the applicant is the first informant. It is alleged that the Airport Authority of India gave certain lands to the applicant for developing the Mumbai International Airport. Land admeasuring 21.45 acres is a part and parcel of the larger piece of land given by the Airport Authority of India to the applicant. It is the prosecution case that, the applicant by submitting forged and fabricated property extract pertaining to 21.45 acres land got his name incorporated in the revenue records with a view to claim ownership of the said lands and/or to claim compensation for the same from the Government Authorities.

4. As noted herein-above, it is the precise allegation against respondent No.1 that, the applicant by submitting forged and fabricated property extract pertaining to 21.45 acres land got his name incorporated in the revenue records with a view to claim ownership of the said lands and/or to claim compensation for the same from the Government Authorities. The learned Additional Sessions judge after taking into consideration various aspects of the present matter, was pleased to grant pre-arrest bail to the applicant by the impugned order. The record

further indicates that there are civil litigations pending interse between parties pertaining to the ownership of the said piece of land admeasuring 21.45 acres. Mr. Dethe, who was employee of the Revenue Department is also an accused in the present crime. The investigation of the present crime is based solely on documents, which have already been seized by the police, and therefore, otherwise also the custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary.

5. After taking into consideration the entire material on record, this Court is of the view that the impugned Order does not suffer from any error either in law or on facts and no interference at the hands of this Court is therefore warranted.

6. Application is devoid of any merits and is accordingly rejected.

(A.S.GADKARI, J.)