

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

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 391 OF 2016
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1117 OF 2005**

Sopan Ramchandra BhosaleApplicant

In the matter between :-

Dilip Pandurang DaboleAppellant

Versus

The State of MaharashtraRespondent

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1543 OF 2017
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1117 OF 2005**

Dilip Pandurang DaboleApplicant

Versus

The State of MaharashtraRespondent

Mr. Prasanna A. Bhangale for the applicant.

Mr. P.H. Gaikwad, APP for the State.

Ms. Karishma R.K. for respondent no.2.

***CORAM : SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.
DATE : 04th DECEMBER, 2017***

P.C. :

1. By judgment dated 16th April, 2005 in Sessions Case No. 1106 of 1998 with Sessions Case No. 178 of 1999, the 3rd Ad-hoc Additional Sessions Judge, Sewri, Mumbai, has convicted respondent no.2/appellant for offence punishable under Section 412 of the Indian

Penal Code.

2. By order dated 07th December, 2005 passed by this Court, the appellant/respondent no.2 was ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties in the like amount. By order dated 16th January, 2006, the said order was modified and the bail amount was reduced to sum of Rs.20,000/- with all other conditions remaining intact. Pursuant to the said orders, the applicant has furnished bail bond of Rs.20,000/- with two sureties to the like amount. The other condition viz. to report to the police station was further modified by order dated 26th July, 2010.

3. The present application i.e. Criminal Application No. 391 of 2016 is filed by one of the sureties seeking his discharge, whereas the Criminal Application No. 1543 of 2017 is filed by the respondent no.2/appellant seeking modification of bail order and to waive the condition of local surety.

4. Ms. Karishma R.K., learned counsel for the respondent no.2/appellant submits that she has already furnished one local surety. She submits that in lieu of the second surety, the applicant may be permitted to deposit cash surety.

5. In view of the reasons stated by the applicant in Criminal Application No. 391 of 2016, he is discharged. In lieu of the second surety, the respondent no.2/appellant is permitted to deposit a sum of

Rs.30,000/- (Rupees Thirty Thousand) before the Additional Sessions Judge, Sewri, Mumbai within two weeks from today.

6. Both Criminal Applications stands disposed of accordingly.

(SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)