

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3459 OF 2022

Bhagwat Govind Gundare	...Applicant
V/s.	
The State of Maharashtra	...Respondent

Ms, Kshitija V. Sarangita, for the Applicant.

Mr. Amit Palkar, APP, for the Respondent/State.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.

DATE : 14th DECEMBER, 2022.

PC. :

This is an application filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for anticipatory bail.

2. The applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No. 520 of 2022 registered at Hinjewadi Police Station, for the offence punishable under Section 370(3) of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 4, 5 of the Immoral Traffic Prevention Act, 1986 (for short P.I.T.A. Act).

3. On 03/06/2022, on the basis of secret information raid was conducted at Triveni lodge Balewadi, Pune and the present applicant and other co-accused were found to be running brothel there.

4. I have heard the learned Counsel for the applicant and the

learned APP for the Respondent/State.

5. The learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is submitted that the present applicant came to be implicated on the basis of statement of co-accused. It is further submitted that the applicant is not involved in any other crime of similar nature and his custodial interrogation is not necessary as nothing to be recovered at the instance of the present applicant.

6. On the other hand the learned APP for the respondent/State submits that the victims in the present case were induced by the present applicant to indulge in the activity of prostitution. It is submitted that considering the nature of offence, the applicant may not be released on anticipatory bail.

7. I have perused the statement of victims. They have stated that the present applicant was making all the arrangements for them and they were called at Pune by him. They have further stated that the applicant used to take about Rs. 3,000/- to 5,000/- from the customers and used to pay them about Rs. 2,500/-. Considering the statement of the victims, I am not inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail.

8. Hence, the application is rejected.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]