



statement of the child who was kidnapped, it cannot be gathered that the applicant is involved in the alleged offence. It is further submitted that on the date of the registration of the offence against the applicant, there is no material available with the prosecution to show the involvement of the applicant. It is further argued that since the charge-sheet has been filed, no further custody of the applicant is required.

4. It is submitted that, there is nothing to show that the mobile number of which CDR was collected belongs to the applicant.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP strongly opposed the application. It is pointed out that the applicant was continuously in contact with the co-accused and as far as conspiracy is concerned, the mobile location shows that all the accused gathered at the garage of the applicant on 03.09.2023.

6. It is pointed out that the car which was used in the present offence, the colour of the same and the number plate were changed by the applicant.

7. Having gone through the charge-sheet and the material collected by the IO during the investigation, it is evident that there is sufficient evidence against the applicant to show that he was in contact with the co-accused and he met with them on 03.09.2023 at his garage.

8. From the record it has come on the record that all the mobile phones which were seized either from the applicant or from the car used in the offence, are the stolen one. Moreover, from the number of the mobile recovered from the applicant, it was found that the

applicant was in contact with the co-accused. It was also revealed from the same number's CDR and location that co-accused and the applicant were gathered in the garage of the applicant on 03.09.2023, when they allegedly hatched a conspiracy to kidnap the child.

9. Further the evidence shows that the applicant got changed the colour of the vehicle after the alleged incident and also the number plate.

10. Thus, prima facie involvement of the applicant is apparent. Moreover, the offence is serious and there is every possibility that if the applicant is released on bail, he may pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the prosecution evidence, I do not find the present case as a fit case for grant of bail.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J)