

**First Information Report****(U/s 154 of CrPC)****Gandevi Police Station M Case no. 3/02**

1. Sub-District: Navsari District: Navsari Time of offence: At any time  
From Date: 26/02/2002 till date.

- 
1. Date and time of reporting of the offence: Date: 16/07/02 Time: 14:30 o'clock.
  2. Place of offence and the direction and distance from PS: at Gandevi People's Co. Op. Bank Ltd., on the east at 200 m, Town Beat, Ta. Gandevi.
  3. Date of sending from Police Station: 16/07/2002
  4. Name and address of the complainant / informer: Champakbhai R. Mali, aged about 55, occupation: Business, Res. Uganam Street, Gandevi, Ta. Gandevi, Dist. Navsari.
  5. Name and addresses of the accused:
    - (1). Home Trade Ltd
    - (2). Nandkishor Shankarlal Trivedi
    - (3). Ketan Sheth
    - (4). Vijay Hariram Agrawal
    - (5). Subodh Bhandari
    - (6). Hiten Bhupendra Shah
    - (7). Hiren Gada
    - (8). Sashank Gopal Ranade
    - (9). Vijay Himmatlal Modi
    - (10). Salil Dinkarlal Gandhi, All residents of Mumbai

- (11) Allen James
- (12) Rasal Bank Vegar, No. 11-12 both residing at USA
- (13) Mike alias Manoj Ambelal Shah, Res.
- (14) Dhananjay Agrawal
- (15) Shilpa Hiten Shah
- (16) Jagruti Ketan
- (17) Kanan Mevawala
- (18) Ketan R. Maskariya, No. 14 to 18, R/o. Mumbai.
- (19) Niraj Surati
- (20) Smt. Kruti Niraj Surati, No. 19-20 both R/o. Bharuch.

6. Brief Fact of Offence and if any property stolen, its short description:

Under IPC Section-406, 420, 120B. The fact of the offence is that at the above mentioned time and place, the accused persons mentioned in column no. 5, the office bearers of Home Trade Ltd, Mumbai, committed fraud of Rs. 2, 90,162.50/-, the amount that was given to the accused by Gandevi People's Co. Op. Bank Ltd to purchase the government securities, and the accused caused financial damage to the bank by hatching the conspiracy and committed fraud.

7. Action taken regarding the investigation and the explanation in case there is delay in writing down the first information.

Sd/- Illegible

PSI, Gandevi (PSO)

Write the first information below and obtain the signature or thumb impression of the informer to confirm that it is true, and the officer writing down the first information will put his countersignature.

In the Court of Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate,  
Criminal Case No. 11/2002

Complainant: Champakbhai R. Mali, aged about 55 years, occupation: Job,  
Res. Ugaman Street, Gandevi, Ta. Gandevi, Dist. Navsari.

Res.

(1) Home Trade Limited, Address: Mittal Court, "A" Wing, 143, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Nariman Point, Mumbai-400021. (2) Mr. Nandkishor Shankarlal Trivedi, aged 45, occupation: Business, Res. Devbhuvan, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Chira Bazaar, Mumbai. (3) Mr. Ketan Kantilal Sheth, aged about 40, occupation: business, Res. 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor cross road, Road No. 9, Juhu, Mumbai. (4) Mr. Sanjay Hariram Agrawal, aged about 35, occupation: business, Res. Juhu, Shalimar CHS Gulmahor cross road no. 10, Juhu, Mumbai. (5) Mr. Subodh Bhandari, aged about 46, occupation: business, Res. 704-B, Govind Complex, Sector No. Vasi, Vubre, Navi Mumbai-400705. (6) Mr. Hitendra Bhupendra Shah, adult aged, occupation: business, Res. 102, Gandhi Nivas, Ashok Nagar road, Vakola, Shantakruz, Mumbai-400055. (7) Mr. Hiren Gada, adult aged, occupation: business, senior vice president, Home Trade Limited, Address: Mittal Court, 'A' Wing, 143, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Nariman Point, Mumbai-400021. (8) Mr. Sashank Gopal Ranade, aged 40, occupation: business, Res. 3/1, Radhakrishna Nivas, Ground Floor, SK Bole Road, Dadar (CWJ), Mumbai. (9) Mr. Vijay Himmatlal Modi, aged about 46, occupation: Business, Res. A – 203, Amita Co. O. Housing Society, Kulupavadi road, Borivalli (East), Mumbai-400063. (10) Salil Dinkarlal Gandhi, aged about 43, occupation: Business, Res. 11/13, Gold Coin Co. O. Ha. Society, Tardev, Mumbai-400034. (11) Allen James Macmillan, aged about 41 years, occupation: Business, Res. 785, Castro Street, Montague, CA-94041, USA. (12) Rasal Bankcam Vegar, adult aged, occupation: business, Res. Timber Hill Terrace, Aayan Field, M. A. 1940,

USA. (13) Mr. Mike alias Manoj Ambelal Shah, aged about 58 years, occupation: Business, Res. Belari road, RMV Extension, Bangalore-506080. (14) Mr. Dhananjay Agrawal, adult aged, occupation: business, Director, Home Trade Ltd., Address: Mittal Court, 'A' Wing, 143, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Nariman Point, Mumbai-400021. (15) Smt. Shilpa Hiten Shah, adult aged, occupation: Business, Res. 102, Gandhi Nivas, Ashok Nagar Road, Vakola, Shantakruz, Mumbai-400055. (16) Smt. Jagruti Ketan Sheth, adult aged, Res. 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor Cross Road, Road no. 9, Juhu, Mumbai. (17). Kanan Mcvawala, aged about 28, occupation: Business, Res. Jayant Mahal, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Opp. Vankhede Stadium, Marine Drive, Mumbai. (18). Mr. Ketan R. Maskariya, aged about 35 years, occupation: business, Director, Home Trade Ltd., Address: Mittal Court, 'A' Wing, 143, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Nariman Point, Mumbai-400021. (19) Mr. Niraj A. Surati, aged about 34, occupation: Business, Res. Surya Flats, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, above Surya Shopping Complex, Sevashram Road, Bharuch-392001. (20). Smt. Kruti Niraj Surati, adult aged, occupation: business, Res. Matru Ashish, beside Rungata Eye Hospital, Singhvai road, Bharuch-392001.

Gandevi People's Co. O. Bank has been established as per the Gujarat Cooperative Act and its sub-rules and in order to do the banking work, Reserve Bank of India, Ahmedabad has granted necessary license to the bank for the banking activities. The head office of our bank is located at Gandevi and the other offices are located at Bilimora and Chikhali. The Board of Directors of the bank, vide the resolution no. 2 (A) 3 dated 19/05/2002, has authorized me the complainant to carry out legal proceedings against the accused of this case. Accordingly, I have lodged the present complaint against the accused of this

Accused no. 1 has the firm titled Messrs Home Trade Limited and the said firm is registered in the National Stock Exchange as the share and stock broker and the accused no. 1 to 18 of this case are the directors of the said firm,

while accused no. 19 and 20 are doing business at Bharuch and he identify himself as the agent of the firm of accused no. 1 and he has stated so before me the complainant.

I, the complainant, trusted his statements and accepted him as agent of Accused No. 1's firm while proceeding with the transactions. Accused Nos. 2 to 18 directly manage and oversee the operations of Accused No. 1's firm, making them responsible for its administration. Accordingly, the present complaint has been filed against the accused.

(3) In this case, Accused No. 3, Mr. Ketan Sheth, is a leading stockbroker in Mumbai. He presented himself as a reputed stockbroker and, around 1999, claimed to be a director of Euro Asian Securities Limited, which was a member of the National Stock Exchange. The said company operated under the Banking Regulation Act of 1949. Additionally, all cooperative banks were mandated to comply with the Reserve Bank of India's directives, and accordingly, the complainant bank was also required to invest in government securities through the SLR (Statutory Liquidity Ratio).

Based on the above facts and legal requirements, and trusting the statements of Accused No. 3, Ketan Sheth, in October 1999, the complainant bank paid ₹ 25, 77,358.61 via cheque number 33956 drawn on Maharashtra State Co-operative Bank Limited, Mumbai, for the purchase of government securities. The accused ensured that the transaction was executed in a manner that satisfied the complainants.

Later, in May 2000, Accused No. 3, Ketan Sheth, along with Accused No. 4, Sanjay Agarwal, and Accused No. 2, Nandkishor Trivedi, visited the complainant bank's main branch and informed that they had changed the name of Euro Asian Securities Limited to Home Trade Limited. They stated that Home Trade Limited was a member of the National Stock Exchange, and its management consisted of highly skilled technocrats. They requested that future government securities transactions be conducted through Home Trade Limited.

Additionally, the accused claimed that another sister company of Home Trade Limited, Ways India Limited, was engaged in business transactions involving celebrities like Shah Rukh Khan, Hrithik Roshan, Sachin Tendulkar, and Priyanka Chopra. They invited the complainant bank's directors to visit their office in Mumbai to understand the company's operations firsthand. Due to this request, the complainant bank's directors visited the accused company's software park office in Navi Mumbai. The said office was ultra-modern (some sentences are missing), and as per the accused's statements, most stock exchange operations in Mumbai were handled through their firm.

From the beginning, the accused misrepresented information to the complainant bank, making false claims and attempting to build a misleading reputation for efficient operations.

(6). Trusting the statements of the accused and to maintain the SLR (Statutory Liquidity Ratio), we, the complainants, engaged in the following financial transactions with the accused:

Details of Financial Transactions:

(A) In October 1999, a transaction was made to purchase government securities worth ₹25, 77,358.61. Payment was made via cheque number 63956 from Maharashtra State Co-operative Bank Limited.

(B) In May 2002, among the accused, Ketan Sheth, Sanjay Agarwal, and Trivedi visited Gandevi and informed that the firm previously known as Euro Asian Securities Limited had been renamed as Home Trade Limited. They claimed that Home Trade Limited was involved in government securities transactions and was a member of the stock exchange. They further requested future transactions to be conducted through their firm. Additionally, they presented Home Trade Limited as a highly professional institution managed by

expert professionals. They said that prominent personalities such as Shahrukh Khan, Hrithik Roshan, Sachin Tendulkar, and Priyanka Chopra were involved in expanding the firm's operations.

Taking their representation and request into consideration, we visited their office in Navi Mumbai. They provided (1-2 sentences missing).

(C) As per the representation of the accused, on 16/01/2001, we had asked to purchase government securities and provided the accused with contract note numbers 6405 and 6407, dated 16/ (unclear). The contract was valued at ₹1, 98, and 95,641.66.

(D) Vide Contract Note No. 6403 and 6 (illegible/ unreadable) of the accused, we had purchased the securities and in this regard we were supposed to make the payment of Rs. (illegible/unreadable) and in this regard, we have deposited the said amount vide cheque no. 069109 of HDFC Bank.

(E) As the second deal, we asked the accused to sell the government securities of Rs. 2,21,90,375/-, the accused had given the contract note no. 6815 and 6817 in this regard and we had given the securities to the accused in this regard. Against the said selling, we had purchased the security of GOI 2015 of 9.85% of Rs. 2,02, 38, 305.56 vide the contract note no. 6813 of the accused and the accused had paid the amount of difference of Rs. 19,52,069.44 paisa. Despite this, the accused had not given the physical possession of the securities of the note no. 6813.

(F). During the period of November, 2001, we had asked the accused to give the security of the note no. 381 (Illegible). So, the accused said that the said security will bring benefit at the time of selling. So, we had asked the accused to sell the said security and the accused had said that the said security has been

sold at the price of Rs. 2,16,68,694.44 vide contract note no. 6867 dated 15/11/2001.

(G). In order to fulfill the requirement of SLR, we had asked the accused to purchase the security of GOI 2019,10.03%, and the accused had given the contract note no. 6869 dated 15/11/2001 of Rs. 2,72,93,665.67 in this regard, the accused had given the note no. 6869 dated 15/11/2001 of Rs. 2,72,93,665.67 in this regard, and we had paid the amount of difference of Rs. 56,24,972.23 paisa to the accused vide the cheque no. 297812 of HDFC bank. In this regard, the accused were supposed to give the security to us in December 2001.

(H). During the period of date 13/12/2001, instead of accepting the delivery of the said security, we the complainant had asked the accused to sell the said security and in this regard, the accused had given the contract note no. 6939 dated 16/12/2001 of Rs. 2,90,16,743/-.

(I). In order to fulfill the requirement of our SLR, we had (one line missing in photocopy of source language) purchased the security vide contract note no. 6941 dated 16/12/2001 of Rs.2, 79,333.33 and the accused has paid the amount of difference of Rs. 10, 58,409.33 paisa was paid to us by the accused vide the cheque, and the accused was supposed to make the delivery of the said security to us the complainant. In this regard, we had asked the accused and the accused had sent the contract note no. (Illegible/missing in photocopy) dated 26/02/2002 of Rs. 2, 86, 79,062.50 paisa to us.

(7). To fulfill our requirement, we had asked the accused of this case to purchase the security of GOI 2017, 6.07%. So, the accused has given the contract note no. 7437 dated 26/02/2002 of Rs. 2, 90, 10,162.50 paisa and the accused were supposed to give the said security to us the complainant. But the accused, in connivance with one another from the very beginning, misrepresented themselves before us and enticed us with mala fide intention

and siphoned off crores of rupees from us and it will cause financial damage to us. Despite knowing this, the accused obtained the amount from us and embezzled the money for their personal benefit and committed fraud of crores of rupees with us and despite our repeated demands, the accused do not return the security of the note no. 7437 dated 23/02/2002 of 8.07% GOI 2070 to us, do they give it to us, and despite the fact that we the complainant made repeated attempts to contact the accused on phone, fax and in person now and again, the accused do not come to their usual business place, nor do they come to their residential place, nor do they give us the security that we have been demanding from them. They do not act as per what they have promised to us. Then, we came to know from the newspapers, TV and the other sources that the accused who had purchased the security of the contract note no. 2017 dated 26/02/2002 of Rs. 2,90,10,162.50 paisa and the accused of this case have (last bottom line of the source language is missing) and the accused intentionally committed the said acts mentioned in the complaint with us the complainant and have committed the offences of serious nature punishable under IPC Section 406, 420, 421 etc., therefore, on 09/07/2002, I lodge my complaint against the said accused. My witnesses are as follows.

- (1). I complainant myself
- (2). Mr. Akshay R. Desai, Director, The Gandevi People's Co. Op. Bank Ltd, Res. Gandevi.
- (3). Mr. Mukesh Mehta, Director, The Gandevi People's Co. Op. Bank Ltd., Res. Bilimora.
- (4). Mr. Manharlal D. Shah, Director, Gandevi People's Co. Op. Bank Ltd., Res. Gandevi.

- (5). Mr. Kishor T. Patel, Director, The Gandevi People's Bank Ltd., Res. Gandevi.
- (6). Mr. Gulabbhai B. Patel, Director, The Gandevi People's Bank Limited, Res. Gandevi.

If required, we will produce further witnesses in connection with the investigation.

Date: 10/07/2002.

Acknowledgement

Today I the complainant do acknowledge at Gandevi and state that the above facts stated in the complaint are true and correct to be best of my knowledge and belief.

Date: 10/07/2002.

The above written complaint was received from Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate First Class, Gandevi, bearing outward no. 763/02 it being Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 11102 dated 12/07/2002 for investigation, the offence has been registered with Gandevi Police Station vide CR No. 03/02 date: 16/07/2002 and the report under Section 157 has been made.

Sd/- Illegible

Police Sub Inspector

Gandevi

Dispatched with compliments to:-

Hon'ble Judicial First Class Magistrate, Gandevi Court

Date: 16/07/2002.

Exh-2

To,  
Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate First Class,  
Gandevi.

I, A. M. Sarang, Circle Police Inspector, Bilimora, kindly report that,  
In connection with Gandevi Police Station M-Case No. 3/2002 registered  
under IPC Section- 406, 409, 420, 120b, 467, 468, accused Ketan Kantilal  
Sheth, aged 40, Res. 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor Crossroad No. 9, was arrested  
at 22:00 o'clock on 06/09/2002 and has been sent to the Court custody of this  
Hon'ble Court in time. It is requested to take him in the Court custody.

Date: 07/09/2002

Sd/- Illegible  
(A. M. Sarang)  
Circle Police Inspector  
Bilimora

The accused produced before me on 07/09/2002 at 18:00 hrs. There is no  
complaint against the police. Released on bail. Taken in police custody till  
12:09:2002.

Sd/- Illegible Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Gandevi. 07/09/2002.

**Exh-3**

To,  
 Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate First Class,  
 Gandevi.

**Subject:** To grant 12 days' police custody remand of the accused in connection with Gandevi Police Station M-Case No. 3/2002 under IPC section-406, 420, 467,468,120b.

I, A. M. Sarang, Circle Police Inspector, Bilimora, kindly report that,

In connection with Gandevi Police Station M-Case No. 3/2002 under IPC section-406, 420, 467,468,120b, The Gandevi People's Co. Op. Bank Ltd., Gandevi had given the contract note no. 7437 dated 26/02/2002, 8.07% GOI 2070, Rs. 2,90,10,162.50 to the director Ketan Kantilal Sheth, and other office bearers of Home Trade Ltd, Mumbai to purchase the government securities. The office bearers of Home Trade gained the trust of the office bearers of the bank committed fraud with the bank.

The accused Ketan Kantilal Sheth, aged 40, Res. 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor Cross Road No. 9, JVPD Scheme, Andheri West, Mumbai, No. 49, the director of Home Trade Ltd, Mumbai has been arrested at 22:00 o'clock on 06/09/2002 and the presence of the said accused is required in connection with the investigation for the following reasons, therefore, it is requested to grant 12 days' police custody remand of the said accused in connection with the investigation. The copy of the case diary of the investigation is attached herewith.

- (1). To collect the documents of the contract related to the government security made with The Gandevi People's Co. Op. Bank Ltd, Gandevi from Mumbai.
- (2). To investigate who others are involved in forging the contract Note issued regarding the security?

(3). To investigate in which banks the amount of Rs. 2,90,10,162.50 invested in the security has been invested at Mumbai?

(4). To find out whether the amount of the security has got deposited in the bank of RBI at Ahmedabad? And in order to collect the related documents.

(5). Since only this accused know the co-accused of this offence, therefore, he will have the information about the co-accused regarding their addresses and residences, therefore, in order to carry out the investigation at Mumbai, Bharuch and at Ahmedabad in this regard.

For the reasons stated above, the accused Ketan Kantilal Seth, residing at 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor Cross Road No. 9, Andheri West, Mumbai No. 49, is very much required for the investigation, as other accused can be reached through him. Additionally, his presence is necessary to ascertain in which banks/companies in Mumbai the funds of the securities purchased by Gandevi People's Co. Op. Ltd., Gandevi, have been invested. His presence is also required for investigations in Mumbai, Bharuch, and Ahmedabad. Therefore, considering the above reasons, it is requested to grant 12 days' police custody remand of the accused in the interest of justice.

The copy of the case diary of the investigation is attached herewith.

Date: 07/09/2002

Sd/- Illegible  
(A.M. Sarang)  
(Circle Police Inspector)  
Bilimora

ORDER:

Heard. Taking into account the seriousness of the case, to ensure that the police is given the chance of investigation, the accused is sent to police custody remand till 05:00 o'clock of 12/09/2002.

Sd/- Illegible

07/09/2002

Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Gandevi.

Sd/- Illegible

Accused and remand warrant received.

CPI (Circle Police Inspector)

**Exh-4****In the Court of Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate First Class of Valsad.****M. Case No. 3/2002**

Complainant: The State Government

Accused : Ketan Kantilal Sheth

103, Liberty Apartment, Sarojini road, Vile Parley,  
(West), Mumbai.

Whose advocates

Mr. Ayaz Ahmad Shekh (M. Sc., LLB)

Mr. Anish K. Ghanchi (B. Com., LLB)

Mr. Manish N. Rana (B. A., LLB)

Mr. H. M. Kureshi

Have been appointed as an advocate to represent me in court, manage the case, conduct private negotiations, sign on my behalf in those negotiations, and handle all matters related to the said case.

In witness thereof, we have signed on the date 7-9-2002.

We the advocates are not the members of the welfare fund.

Signature

1. Sd/- Illegible

2. ....

3. ....

4. ....

5. ....

Sd/- Illegible

Sd/- Illegible

Sd/- Illegible

Sd/- Illegible

Address:-

Ayaz Ahmad Shekh,

M. Sc., LLB, Advocate,

G-1, Imam Apartment,

Dhanbhura Road, Valsad.

Tel. O. 56574 R. 43539

Exh-5

To,  
Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate First Class,  
Gandevi.

I, A. M. Sarang, Circle Police Inspector, Bilimora, kindly report that,

In connection with Gandevi Police Station M-Case No. 3/2002 registered under IPC Section- 406, 409, 420, 120b, 467, 468, accused Ketan Kantilal Sheth, aged 40, Res. 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor Crossroad No. 9, was arrested at 22:00 o'clock on 06/09/2002 and the police custody remand of the accused was received till 17:00 o'clock of 12/09/2002, therefore, as the remand period of the said accused is ending, he has been sent to the Court custody of this Hon'ble Court today in time and it is requested to take him in the Court custody. The warrant of the accused is attached herewith.

Date: 12/09/2002.

Sd/- Illegible

(B. M. Sarang)

Circle Police Inspector

Bilimora

The accused was produced before me at 17:00 hrs. On 12/09/2002. There is no complaint against the police. Released on bail. Taken in the Judicial Custody till date: .....

Date: 12/09/2002.

Sd/- Illegible

Judicial Magistrate, First Class,

Gandevi.

**Exh-6**

To,  
Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate First Class,  
Gandevi.

Subject: To grant 04 days' police custody remand of the accused in connection with Gandevi PS M Case No. 3/2002 under IPC Section 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 120B.

I, A. M. Sarang, Circle Police Inspector, Bilimora, kindly report that,

In connection with Gandevi Police Station M-Case No. 3/2002 registered under IPC Section- 406, 409, 420, 120b, 467, 468, accused Ketan Kantilal Sheth, aged 40, Res. 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor Crossroad No. 9, was arrested at 22:00 o'clock on 06/09/2002 and the police custody remand of the accused was received till 17:00 o'clock of 12/09/2002, but for the below mentioned reasons, the investigation has remained uncompleted and the presence of the accused is very much required during the investigation. Therefore, it is requested to grant 04 days' police custody remand of the accused in the interest of justice in connection with the investigation.

- (1). The presence of the accused is required at the office of the Registration of Companies (ROC), at Pune.
- (2). In order to conduct the live detective test of the accused at Ahmedabad.
- (3). To conduct the investigation of the co-accused who are involved in the office with the accused.
- (4). As the record regarding the financial transactions made by Home Trade Ltd and the accused made in different banks will become available in Mumbai in 2 days, and in order to interrogate the accused on the basis of the said information regarding the financial transactions, the presence of the accused is required.

(5). As the statements of the officers of Reserve Bank of India, Ahmedabad who had conducted the audit of the Gandevi People's Bank are to be taken, the accused and the bank audit officer will be cross-interrogated, and therefore, the presence of the accused is required.

For above reasons, the presence of the accused is necessary in connection with the investigation, therefore, it is requested to grant 04 days' police custody remand of the accused.

Sd/- Illegible

(C. M. Sarang)

Circle Police Inspector, Bilimora

*Heard. In order to see that the police gets enough chance of the investigation, it is ordered to grant the 05 days' police custody remand of the accused till 13/07/2002.*

*Sd/- Illegible, 12/07/2002*

*Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Gandevi*

The custody of the accused and the warrant have been received.

Sd/- Illegible, PC 754

**Exh-7**

**To,**  
**Hon'ble Judicial Magistrate, First Class,**  
**Gandevi.**

I, A. M. Sarang, Circle Police Inspector, Bilimora, kindly report that,

In connection with Gandevi Police Station M-Case No. 3/2002 registered under IPC Section- 406, 409, 420, 120b, 467, 468, accused Ketan Kantilal Sheth, aged 40, Res. 193, Lalit Kutir, Gulmahor Crossroad No. 9, Andheri West, Mumbai, was produced on 12/09/2002, and his one day police custody remand was received till 17:00 o'clock of 13/09/2002. As the remand period of the said accused is ending today, he has been sent today to take him in the Court custody in time. Therefore, it is requested to take him in the court custody. The original warrant is attached herewith. This is for your kind information.

Date: 13/09/2002

Sd/- Illegible

(A.M. Sarang)

Circle Police Inspector

**Bilimora**

The accused was produced before me at 17:00 o'clock on 13/09/2002, and he has not made any complaint against the police, and has got released on bail. Taken in the judicial custody till 27/09/2002.

Date: 13/09/2002

Sd/- Illegible

Judicial Magistrate, Gandevi.

The custody of the accused and the warrant have been received.

Sd/ Illegible

PC 754

Exh-8

Navsari Town Police Station.

Date: 12/09/2002. Exh-8

To,  
Hon'ble J. C. J. (JD) and  
Judicial Magistrate, First Class,  
Gandevi.

Subject: To hand over the custody of the accused through  
transfer warrant.

I, R. S. Patel, Police Sub Inspector, Navsari Town Police Station, kindly  
report that,

In connection with the offence registered with Navsari Town Police  
Station vide I-CR No. 93/2002 under IPC Section 406, 409, 420, 421, 422, 423,  
467, 468, 120B, 34, accused Ketanbhai Kantilal Sheth (Shah), aged 42, Res.  
193, Lalit Kutir, CHS, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, JVPD, Mumbai – 40049 is still to be arrested  
in the said offence, and at present he is in the police custody of Gandevi Police  
since 22:30 o'clock of 06/09/2002 in connection with Gandevi Police Station  
M-Case No. 3/2002 registered under IPC Section-406, 409, 420, 467, 468 etc.,  
a transfer warrant of my name has been obtained from Hon'ble Chief Judicial  
Magistrate, Navsari in order to arrest the said accused in connection with  
Navsari Town Police Station vide I-CR No. 93/2002 under IPC Section 406,  
409, 420, 421, 422, 423, 467, 468, etc., is annexed herewith, therefore, it is  
requested to grant the custody of the accused to us once his custody in Gandevi  
Police Station is over. This is for your kind information. Date: 13/09/2002.

Sd/- Illegible

Police Sub Inspector

Navsari Town Police Station