

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1178 OF 2019

Ranjeet Kalildev Chaudhary

...Applicant

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra
(At the instance of Tulinj
Police Station vide C.R.
No. 1087 of 2018)

....Respondent

Ms. Anjali Patil, Advocate for the applicant.

Ms. Rutuja Aambekar, APP for State.

P.I. Mr. V.J. Aahire, Tulinj Police Station,
Palghar present.

CORAM : SANDEEP K. SHINDE, J.

Thursday, 14th November, 2019.

P.C. :

1. Heard. Investigating Officer is present.

2. In Crime No. 1087 of 2018 registered with
Tulinj Police Station, Palghar on 9th October, 2018

for the offences punishable under Sections 379, 413 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code applicant was arrested on 27th October 2018, on transfer of his custody from Crime No. 231/2018. Affidavit of Investigating Officer shows, twenty-nine crimes of similar nature are registered against him.

3. Investigation shows, a "creta-car", theft property was discovered on 28th October, 2019 on voluntary disclosure made by the applicant while in police custody, from the jurisdiction of Mumbra Police Setation. Infact, the same Creta Car was found in abandoned condition at Bedekar Nagar, Village-Diva within the jurisdiction of Mumbra Police Station and thus it was seized on 10th October itself.

4. Argument is, two-fold; applicant is in custody for more than, a year and alleged recovery of "creta car" has been wrongly relied upon by the prosecution. Submission is, applicant has no

connection with the theft of subject car. It may be stated, "car" was discovered at the instance of the applicant. Even, though, it was seized by another Police Station, much before the "disclosure" by the applicant, it hardly matters. Even otherwise, twenty-nine crimes of similar nature registered, dis-entitles him to claim bail. Application is rejected.

5. The learned Counsel for the applicant submits that when this application was heard on 20th September, 2019 the applicant was directed to file Affidavit/Undertaking that he will not enter the area/jurisdiction of the Tulinj Police Station and not indulge into similar offences and committed any other offences in future. Today, the Affidavit is tendered across the bar. It is taken on record and marked X-1 for identification.

6. However, taking into consideration the facts of the case and antecedents, I am not satisfied with the Affidavit.

7. That for the reason stated hereinabove, the Bail Application is rejected. The request of the applicant to expedite the trial is rejected.

(SANDEEP K. SHINDE, J.)