

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

rrpa

CRI. APPLICATION NO.83 OF 2015

Ahemad Raja Siddique @ Chira .. Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra .. Respondent

....
Mr. Shaikh Mohammed Imran, Advocate for the Applicant.
Mr. S.H. Yadav, A.P.P. for Respondent – State.
....

CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.

DATED : FEBRUARY 18, 2015.

P.C. :

Heard learned counsel for the Applicant and learned
A.P.P. for the Respondent – State of Maharashtra.

2 By this application, the applicant seeks reduction of the
bail amount granted to the applicant vide order dated 8th May, 2014,
passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Greater Mumbai, below
Exhibit 3 in Sessions Case No.291 of 2014.

3 The learned counsel for the applicant contended that the
applicant's application for bail on 8th May, 2014, was allowed by the
Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai in connection with C.R.No.12 of

2014, registered with the Bhandup Police Station for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 452, 506, 504, 392, 394, 395 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 37(1)A and 135 of the Bombay Police Act.

4 The learned Sessions Judge by his order released the applicant on bail on executing P.R.Bond of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) with one solvent surety in the like amount along with other conditions. The learned counsel for the applicant contended that the applicant is poor and is unable to furnish the solvent surety of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand). He submitted that, as the applicant was unable to furnish the solvent surety, he was constrained to file another application i.e. Exhibit-19, seeking modification of the earlier order, and sought reduction of the amount from Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) to Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand). The said application i.e. Exhibit 19 came to be rejected by the learned Sessions Judge, vide order dated 12th May, 2014.

5 The learned counsel for the applicant contended that all other accused have been released on bail and only because the applicant is unable to furnish solvent surety of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand), he is languishing in jail, inspite of bail being granted.

6 The applicant being unable to furnish bail is languishing in jail since May 14, thereby defeating the order granting bail. Considering the peculiar facts of the present case and the nature of offences alleged, the amount of bail is reduced to Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand) from Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand).

7 The applicant shall now furnish P.R.Bond of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand), with one or two sureties in the like amount.

8 As far as rest of the conditions which have been imposed vide order dated 8th February, 2015, the same shall continue to remain in operation.

9 The application is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

10 Parties to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

(REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.)