

Amk

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 419 OF 2017

Manikrao Taterao Kadam & Anr.	.. Applicants
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra	.. Respondent

Mr. Hemant P. Ingle for the Applicant.
Mr. Arfan Sait, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : A.S. GADKARI, J.
DATE : 19th APRIL, 2017.

P. C. :

1. This is an application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for pre-arrest bail in C. R. No. I-81 of 2017 dated 13.02.2017 registered with Virar Police Station, District Palghar under Sections 306 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR is lodged by Smt. Mandakini Rameshwar Aakat, the mother of deceased Ashwini. The applicants are in-laws of the deceased Ashwini. It is the prosecution case that on 13.02.2017, Ashwini committed suicide by cutting vein of her wrist. She has left a suicide note making serious allegations against her husband and the present applicants being the parents of the husband. In the suicide note it is categorically alleged that applicant No.2 used to abuse, harass and intimidate her for giving divorce to the husband of the deceased, namely, Sandip. Apart from the serious allegations made in the suicide note, it is also stated by the

deceased that the applicants have made her life miserable, which led her to take an extreme step of ending her life. It clearly appears from the record that the applicants are instrumental in abetting the death of the deceased Ashwini in taking the extreme step of committing suicide thereby ending her life.

3. The contents of the suicide note and the other evidence till date collected by the Investigating Agency, denotes that the applicants were instrumental in abetting the suicide of the deceased Ashwini and therefore it is incumbent on the part of the Investigating Agency to unearth the entire truth behind the crime and the same is not possible without the custodial interrogation of the applicants. After taking into consideration the serious allegations against the applicants and the gravity of the offences, in view of this Court, the applicants does not deserve to be protected by way of pre-arrest bail.

4. The application is, accordingly, rejected.

[A. S. GADKARI, J.]