



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

Criminal Application [APL] No.805 of 2025

Prashant s/o Devidasji Kamdi

vs.

State of Maharashtra, through P.S.O. Ramtek Police Station, Dist. Nagpur and another

*Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.*

Court's or Judge's Orders

Mr. A.A. Korpenwar, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. U.R. Phasate, A.P.P. for Non-Applicant No.1/State.

CORAM : **ANIL L. PANSARE & M.M. NERLIKAR, JJ.**

DATE : **19th AUGUST, 2025.**

By the present application, the applicant is seeking to quash the F.I.R. registered by Ramtek Police Station, District Nagpur for the offences punishable under Sections 3, 4, 5 and 7 of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956 vide Crime No.102/2025.

02. The premises under question is a lodge and restaurant. The applicant is the owner of the premises. He has let out the same to one Mr. Aakash Birve on 22/12/2024 for a period of 11 months. However, the agreement of tenancy was notarized on 13/02/2025. The Investigating Agency carried a raid on 16/02/2025.

03. F.I.R. indicates that two person were found in one room. Out of them, one was the victim and other was the punter. The raid was conducted on the basis of the information received by the police that the applicant and five others are indulged into the activities of immoral trafficking. The police had seized mobile phone, cash amount, condoms etc. Accordingly, F.I.R. came to be lodged against six persons.

04. The argument is that the applicant is not connected with these activities. He has given the premises on rent to Aakash Birve. Accordingly, the learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is unnecessarily roped in the crime.

05. We do not find substance in the argument. The learned A.P.P. is correct in contending that its too earlier to jump to a conclusion that the applicant has no nexus with the crime. According to him, the name of the applicant is mentioned in the F.I.R. The raid has been conducted on the basis of the reliable information. The victim and the punter were found in the room. The person, who facilitated the transportation of victim, has been also named in the F.I.R. The applicant had knowledge of the illegal activities. The truth will be revealed in the investigation.

06. That being so, we are of the view that if the F.I.R. is taken on it's face value, it cannot be said that no offence is made out against the applicant. The question, whether he had knowledge or not will be only revealed during the course of investigation. We are, therefore, not inclined to grant relief. The application is accordingly rejected.

(M.M. Nerlikar, J.)

(Anil L. Pansare, J.)

**sandesh*