

Mr. Aniket Vagal alongwith Mr. Kunal Pednekar and Mr. Divesh Mehani
for the Applicant.
Ms. Rutuja Ambekar, APP for the State.

DATED : 2 JANUARY 2023

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

4. Pursuant to the secret information, on 6 October 2022 a raid was conducted at Avyan Spa, Koregaon Park, Pune and on the pretext of

running Spa, the present applicant and other co-accused were found to be running brothel there.

5. The learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is submitted that according to the prosecution co-accused Shantanu Sarkar is the owner of the Spa in question. It is submitted that according to the victims they were getting salary of Rs.30,000 per month and it is not their version that they were induced to indulge in prostitution activity for pecuniary gain. It is submitted that nothing is to be recovered at the instance of the present applicant and therefore, his custodial interrogation is not necessary.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State submits that the present applicant was running the Spa in question alongwith the co-accused Poonam Jangir. It is submitted that according to statement of the owner of the premises on some occasions the present applicant had paid rent to him. It is submitted that according to the statement of co-accused who was Manager of Spa in question the present applicant used to collect the amount of daily income. The learned APP submitted that the present applicant is involved in one more crime of similar nature.

7. According to the victims, they were required to pay certain amount out of the amount which they were getting from customers for alleged activity of prostitution to Spa Manager. I have perused the statements of the co-accused Ruben Kingpen and the owner of the premises Tanaji Chorge. From their statement, the involvement of present

applicant in alleged crime is apparent. The applicant is involved in one more crime of similar nature. Considering these facts, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the present applicant. In the result, the following order is passed :

(i) Application is rejected.

(N.R. BORKAR, J.)

KANCHAN
PRASHANT
DHURI

Digitally signed
by KANCHAN
PRASHANT
DHURI
Date:
2023.01.02
18:58:47 +0530