

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

CRIMINAL ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 586 OF 2020

Raghu Dhan Sharma

...Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

.....

Mr. V. B. Jaiswal i/b Mr. Sinnharth Jaiswal, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. S. R. Agarkar, APP for the Respondent – State.

Mr. Chetan Pacherwala, Bandra Police Station, Present.

.....

CORAM : PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.

DATE : 11th MARCH, 2020

PC :

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail in C.R. No. 1113 of 2019 registered with Bandra Police Station, Mumbai for offences punishable under Sections 370(3), 34 of Indian Penal Code r/w Sections 3, 4, 5, 7(1)(b) of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act. The First Information Report (for short “FIR”) was registered on 30th December, 2019.

2. The prosecution case is that, information was received by the police about the prostitution activity being conducted at Bunglow situated at Bandra (west) by the applicant and co-accused. The premises were raided. The victims were found. Their statements

were recorded. The applicant had preferred an application for anticipatory bail before Sessions Court which has been rejected by order dated 29th February, 2020.

3. Learned advocate for the applicant submitted that the offences are not made out against the applicant. The allegations about exploitation or sharing amount is made against co-accused. The applicant was not present at the place of incident at the time of raid. The co-accused were arrested and granted bail on the ground that investigation is completed.

4. Learned APP however submitted that there is sufficient evidence against the applicant to show his involvement in the crime. The statement of the victims found at the place of incident was recorded under Section 164(5) of Cr.P.C. disclose complicity of the applicant in the crime.

5. I have perused the FIR and the investigation papers. The information was received by the police that the applicant and co-accused were conducting prostitution business at bungalow situated at Bandra (West). The victim was found at the place of incident. Statement was recorded. The statement of the victim categorically refers to involvement of the applicant. Considering these circumstance, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

6. Hence, I pass the following order :

ORDER

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 586 of 2020
stands rejected and disposed of accordingly.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)