

URMILA
PRAMOD
INGALE

Digitally signed
by URMILA
PRAMOD
INGALE
Date:
2023.03.03
17:58:07 +0530

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

**BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2758 OF 2022
(THROUGH JAIL)**

Ravi Khum Singh @ Bhim Bahadur Mashrangi ..Applicant
VS.

The State of Maharashtra

..Respondent

Mr. Omkar Nagwekar i/b Mr. Rushikesh Patil, for the
Applicant.

Ms. A. A. Takalkar, APP for the State.

CORAM : M. S. KARNIK, J.

DATE : MARCH 3, 2023

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned
APP.

2. This is an application for bail in respect of C.R.No. 103
of 2015 registered with Jogeshwari Police Station for the
offence punishable under sections 489, 34 of the Indian
Penal Code, 1860.

3. The FIR was registered on 22/04/2015. The applicant
is in custody for more than 7 years and 10 months. The
FIR reveals that the informant found the applicant loitering

in suspicious circumstances. The applicant was confronted. It was noticed that he was carrying 100 currency notes of value of Rs.100/- and 100 currency notes of denomination of Rs.500/-. It was later found that the currency is fake.

4. On record, there is an order dated 24/01/2020 passed by the Division Bench of this Court where liberty was granted to the applicant to move the trial Court with a request for day to day hearing. It seems that the appellant is a resident of Nepal and it is the apprehension that he will not attend trial. Along with the applicant, one other co-accused by name Marshal Lobo was found in possession of 100 fake notes of the denomination of Rs.100/- who is released on bail. I have gone through the order dated 15/09/2015 passed by the trial Court. In paragraph 5 of the said order it is observed that the co-accused Marshal Lobo is already released on bail, therefore the applicant had sought bail on the ground of parity. The trial Court had rejected the application on the ground that machineries being used for counterfeiting currency notes are seized at the instance of the applicant and therefore he could not be

granted bail.

5. My attention is invited to the order dated 13/02/2016 whereby the bail application was preferred by the applicant before the trial Court. The trial Court held that the applicant is a foreign national. The trial Court took into consideration the contention of the applicant regarding delayed trial and suo motu expedited the trial directing the investigating officer to tender a programme forthwith by next date. I am informed that 5 witnesses are already examined and there are 6 more witnesses to be examined. In this view of the matter, I am not inclined to release the applicant at this stage. The concern of the applicant is taken care by the trial Court. Liberty to apply after 6 months if the trial does not progress substantially.

6. I appreciate the assistance rendered by Mr. Rushikesh Patil, learned advocate, who was requested to appear on behalf of the applicant.

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)