

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1047 OF 2022

Chandrakant Ramesh Palshetkar

.. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

.. Respondent

Ms. Anjali R. Awasthi a/w Mr. Kaif Ansari, Advocates for the Applicant.
Ms. M. R. Tidke, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : VINAY JOSHI, J.

DATE : 19th APRIL, 2022.

P.C. :

1. In anticipation of arrest in Crime No. 66 of 2022, registered with Khed Police Station, District Ratnagiri, for the offences punishable under Sections 429 r/w 34 of the India Penal Code and Sections 9 and 9A of Animal Preservation Act, the applicant is praying for pre-arrest protection.

2. Amongst other grounds it is primarily canvassed that neither meat was seized from the possession of accused nor he was found at the place of occurrence. It is submission that the car from which meat was seized, was not owned by the applicant, nor anything was seized from his house. The learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant had a license to sell cattle in past. He submits that merely due to rivalry, the applicant has been falsely implicated.

3. It is the prosecution case that on 19th February, 2022, while the police were on patrolling duty, they have seen one car moving in speed, in suspicious condition. The police intercepted the car and apprehended the driver. During search it was found that the car was containing plastic bags full of animal meat. During interrogation, the apprehended accused has informed that co-accused Ayaba Saif Asklam Kureshi has asked him to take meat to Taluka Khed, Ratnagiri at one dhaba, where he would meet the applicant. It was instructed that thereafter the driver would deliver animal meat as per the instructions of the applicant and bring back animal meat, which would be entrusted by the applicant.

4. Perused case diary and particularly statements of the witnesses. No doubt, co-accused has stated direct nexus of the applicant as a receiver of meat, however there are some other statements to show the active role of the applicant. Two statements were recorded on 05th March, 2022 and on 28th February, 2022, wherein both of them have stated that currently the applicant is indulging into purchase of animals and doing the said business.

5. The applicant's learned Counsel has produced a copy of license which has expired long back in the year 2015. *Prima facie* there is material to indicate that the applicant was indulging into business concerning the slaughtering, which is of serious nature. In order to unearth entire racket, custodial interrogation is necessary. In view of that, the application is rejected.

(VINAY JOSHI, J.)