

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.576 OF 2021

Mohd. Salim Qureshi

Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra

Respondent

Mr.Satyaram R. Gaud for applicant.

Mrs.M.R.Tidke, APP, for State.

CORAM : PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.

DATE : 16<sup>th</sup> March 2021

PC :

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail in CR No.88 of 2021 registered with Dharavi Police Station for offences under Sections 363, 341, 394, 324, 504, 506(ii) r/w 34 of Indian Penal Code along with Sections 37(1) and 135 of Maharashtra Police Act.

2. The FIR was lodged on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2021. The complainant has alleged that on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2021 the accused-applicant had obstructed the complainant and threatened him by showing chopper. He was forced to sit on a scooter and abducted. He was taken to the place of incident near Sanjay Chawl. The associates of main accused namely Naved, Kopcha and Asif then assaulted him with fists and kick blows. The applicant pointed out the chopper and took away amount of Rs.8,110/- from his pocket.

3. Learned counsel for applicant submitted that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Custodial interrogation of the

applicant is not necessary. There is delay in lodging the FIR. The complainant had tendered affidavit before Sessions Court stating that the FIR was registered in Marathi language and it was not read over to him in his vernacular language. There is settlement between parties.

4. The application preferred before the Sessions Court was rejected. It is also submitted that the FIR was lodged on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2021 for offences under Section 354 IPC against present complainant by Vahida Salim Qureshi (wife of applicant).

5. Learned APP submitted that the offence is of serious nature. About 10 cases were registered against applicant in the past. He is involved in serious offences. Several times preventive measures were initiated against him. He is creating terror in the locality. He was externed.

6. Considering the contents of FIR, role assigned to the applicant and criminal antecedents, no case for granting relief is made out. Hence, anticipatory bail application is rejected.

7. This order will be digitally signed by the Private Secretary of this Court. All concerned will act on production by fax or e-mail of a digitally signed copy of this order.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)

MST