

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

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1891 OF 2024
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 288 OF 2021**

Leeladhar Aithu Bangera

...Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Leeladhar Bangera	Applicant in-person
Mr. Shreeram Shirsat a/w Ms. Antara Kulkarni	Advocate for the Respondent No. 2- CBI
Mr. H. J. Dedhia	APP for the Respondent No. 1 -State

CORAM : S. M. MODAK, J.

DATE : 09th JULY 2025

P. C. :-

1. Heard the Appellant in-person and learned Advocate Shri Shirsat for the Respondent No. 2-CBI.
2. Pending the appeal, there is a request to de-freeze the properties which are seized during the investigation. It consists of investment receipts, bank accounts and movable properties in the form of jewellery

and other things which are kept in two lockers, the keys of the lockers are possessed by the CBI. Both of them have invited my attention to the observations in para no. 57 to para no. 80. It is matter of record that both CBI as well as the Appellant relied upon the statements which consist of details of the properties.

3. Considering the evidence, the learned trial Judge came to conclusion that the amount of disproportionate assets came to Rs. 59,89,138 (para no. 80) and that is why there was direction to recover that amount from the accused no. 1.

4. It is true when the sentence was suspended on 17.12.2021, this Court has considered the affidavit filed by the Appellant. Paragraph no. 7 of the affidavit mentions about a flat at Mulund. The valuation is Rs. 1,50,00,000/-. The CBI was asked to verify this valuation. It was found correct. That is why the order of recovery was stayed.

5. On this background, the present application is filed. It is true that earlier, the CBI vide the letter dated 08.08.2023 has rejected the request for the return of cash and bank locker keys because the appeal is pending.

6. According to learned Advocate Mr. Shirsat, instead of this Court

undertaking the exercise of verifying the details of all the securities and other movables, let the Appellant may apply to the CBI and CBI will make a proper decision. In the meantime, the application be kept pending. According to him, the details of the properties are not clear.

7. The Appellant agrees to provide those details to the CBI.

8. In view of that let CBI to take a decision about the de-freezing of the properties. In the meantime, the application is kept pending.

9. The Appellant can agitate this application if his request is not accepted by the CBI.

10. Stand over to 20th August 2025.

[S. M. MODAK, J.]