

sbw

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.519 OF 2017

Uday Suresh Surve

... Applicant

vs.

State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

Ms. K. Padmashri i/b. Kulkarni & Associates for the Applicant.

Mr. S. V. Gavand, APP, for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : A.K. MENON, J.

DATE : 12th JUNE, 2017

P.C.

1. By this application, the applicant seeks extension of time to furnish surety.

The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that since the applicant charged under various cases where similar orders of bail were passed but he could not meet the conditions. It was not possible for the applicant to furnish surety within the time initially and as per the directions set out in paragraph 2 of the impugned order. She states that all arrangements have now placed and that surety will be furnished within a period of two weeks from today. However, since such extension of application vide Misc. Application No.2678 of 2016 was rejected, he is unable to do so. She relies upon a similar order in Writ Petition No.4594 of 2016 in the case of very same petitioner where time was extended.

2. Heard the learned APP. In the facts of the case, it is appropriate that the applicant be given one more opportunity based on the applicant's statement

through his counsel that no further application will be made for extension of time. In the circumstances, I pass the following order:-

- (i) Time for furnishing surety is extended by two weeks from today subject to the applicant approaching the Magistrate's Court for seeking necessary orders in this respect.
- (ii) It is made clear that no further applications for extension of time may be made before the Magistrate or before this Court.
- (iii) Application is disposed of in the above terms.
- (iv) Parties to act upon an authenticated copy of this order.

(A. K. MENON, J.)