

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 200 OF 2016
IN
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 109 OF 2016
in
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 50 OF 2016

Nagina @ Nafisa Sarfraz Memon	...	Applicant
vs.		
The State of Maharashtra	...	Respondent

Mr.R.D.Suryawanshi, Advocate for the applicant.
Ms. A.A.Mane, APP, for the State.

CORAM: SMT. SADHANA S.JADHAV, J.
DATE : 29th February, 2016.

P.C.

Not on board. Upon mentioning precipe is taken on board and order is passed on precipe.

The appeal is admitted. By an o4rder dated 2.2.2016, this Court (Coram: Smt. Sadhana S.Jadhav, J.) had allowed the application under Section 389 of Cr.P.C. filed by the present applicant. Clause (iii) of the order as follows :-

“Applicant be enlarged on same bail, fresh bonds.”

2. Needless to say that it means the bail is to be furnished in the same amount but fresh bonds are to be executed. Fresh bonds need not necessarily mean that the same persons shall stand sureties in the application. The applicant is at liberty to furnish sureties of fresh persons who were not standing surety for her at the time of executing the bonds during the pendency of the trial.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the learned Special Court at Thane has not accepted fresh sureties and therefore, need to mention this matter.

4. In view of this, further three weeks' time is granted for furnishing same bail, fresh bonds.

(SMT.SADHANA S.JADHAV, J.)