ADDITION SHIP MARINES AND SHIP SHIP

TH THE COURT OF ADDL CHIEF METROPOL

19th Court, Laplanade, Mumbei.

State (E.O.W.)

. Complainant.

V/s.

Sanjay H. Agarwal

... Accused.

465/BA/02

The present application came to be preferred u/s. 167 (2) (1) of r.P.C., for ball, on the ground that the chargesheet has not been submitted within prescribed period of 90 days. The application am came to be filed before Court hours in the evening on 31.10.2002.

In the ancord massion. The application was kept on 1.11.02 for filing Say by GB CB CID and for order. It is man argued/that today i.e. 12. 1.11.2002. is 90th m day from the detention of accused and since now the chargesheet has been filed, application preferred on behalf of accused cannot be considered. It is to be mentioned that the accused has already exercised his right by presenting application on 11.10.2002 contending that chargesheet has not been filed within 90 days and therefore, he is entitled for bail u/s. 167(2)(1) of Cr.P.C.

It is settled law (Uday Mohanlal Acharva v. State of Maharashtra, reported in 2001 SCC (Cri); 760% r. that on expiry of 90 days/as the case may be, an indefeasible right assured in favour of accused.

2

for being released on bail, if he is prepared to and does furnish the bail as directed by the Magistrate. The proviso is unambiguous and clear and stipulates that the accused shall be released on hail if he is prepared to and does furnish the bail which has been termed by judicial pronouncmement to be "compulsive bail" and such be bail would be deemed to be a bail under Chapter 33. If accused had already exercised his right in filing application for bail u/s.167d(2) (i) of Cr.P.C. for not filing chargesheet within 90 days or 60 days, subsequent act of police in filing chargesheet before the order is passed on his application, would not make accused disentitled to claim the bail as of right. In view of this notified logal posttion eventhough new the chargesheet is filed, the right of accused to be released on bail, It be is not defeated, if his case is covered by the provision. Admittedly, in the instant case, accused came to be arrested on 2.8.2002. He was produced on3.8.2002 on which day he came to be remanded to police custody. 25, held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of CEI, Spl. Investigation Call-I, New Delhi v. Anupam J. Kulkarni reports in 1992 Supreme Court Cames (Gri.) 554 , the period of 90 days or 60 days has to be computed from the

date of detention as per order of Magistrate and not from the date of arrest by the police. So in the instant case period has to be computed from the date of his detention that is: 3.8.02 which has to be included while computing 90 days. It is to be mentioned that the offences alleged against him beside other, are u/s. 409, 467 of I.P. C. which offences are punishablewith imprisonment for life. Therefore, prescribed period of limitation for filing chagesheet would be 90 days.

Thus, computing the m period from 3.8.02,

90 days completes on 31.10.02. On the same day,
before court hours, present application came to
be preferred by accused. It is contention of
A.P.P. that the 90 days completes on 1.11.02, on
which day chargesheet has been filed. In view of th

-e above even period computed from the date of
his detention since 3.8.02, 90 days completes on

31.10.02 mly and not on 1.11.02. Thus, there
is no forde in the contention of A.P.P. on this
point. Since no chargesheet came to be filed within

100 days in before 31.10.02, in view of the
abovementioned settled legal position accused

In view of the above, I accept contention of accused for releasing him on bail u.s.162(2)(1) of Cr.P.C.

## ORDER

The accused Sanjay H. Agarwal is ordered to be released on bail in the sum of \$30,000/- (8. thirty thousand) (1) with one solvent surety in the like amount, we whatered where we want when the like amount, we whatered when we want with a sure of the like amount, we want when the want was a sure of the like amount, we want want was a sure of the like amount, we want want was a sure of the like amount, we want want was a sure of the like amount, we want want was a sure of the like amount, we want want was a sure of the like amount of the like

Dt.2.11.02

n.hullin

mgm.



(B.A.Shelar)

Metropolitan Magistrate,

28th Court i/c.19th Court, splande, Mun

Applied on = 17/12/62

Granted on -17/12/62

Ready on -20/12/02

Delivered on -20/12/02

Charges: -P.S. 6/. Parid

020 20 12-102

TRUE ( 174

Addl. Chief fil Mark. Marking of 18th Court, Capathina, Boz. Day.