

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 91 OF 2020

Namdeo Budha Tayade

Applicant

Versus

Sau. Gauri @ Sarla Suryakant Deshmukh
& another

Respondents

Mr. A.G. Talhar, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. R.B. Bagul, APP for respondent No. 2 – State.
Mr. S.J. Salunke, Advocate for respondent No. 1.

CORAM : M.G. Sewlikar, J.
DATE : 29th January, 2021.

PER COURT :

1. Heard Shri Talhar, learned counsel for the applicant, Shri Bagul, learned APP for the State and Shri Salunke, learned counsel for respondent No.2.

2. It is alleged in the First Information Report that the deceased Sonali married Narendra Sonawane about three years before the incident. Respondent No. 2 is the sister-in-law of the deceased Sonali. It is alleged that the deceased was maintained well for a period of six months after marriage. Thereafter respondent No. 2 and her mother-in-law started saying that she was a bad cook and

that valuable articles were not gifted in the marriage. They started demanding Rs. 30,000/- towards the expenditure incurred for performing cesarean on the deceased. Informant paid Rs. 15,000/- to her mother-in-law. It is alleged against respondent No. 2 that whenever respondent No. 2 visited the matrimonial house of the deceased, she used to instigate the husband of the deceased and other relations to ill-treat the deceased. The deceased committed suicide by self immolation on 10.07.2020. On these allegations, the First Information Report came to be lodged under Sections 306, 498A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalgaon, released respondent No. 2 on anticipatory bail vide order dated 13.08.2020. This order is impugned in this application.

4. Learned counsel Shri Talhar and learned APP Shri Bagul submitted that the First Information Report and the police papers show that respondent No. 2 used to occasionally visit the matrimonial place of the deceased and used to inflict ill-treatment on the deceased. These are vague allegations. On the basis of these vague allegations, it cannot be said that custodial interrogation

- 3 -

of the respondent No. 2 is necessary. In this view of the matter, I do not find any substance in the application. The application is, therefore, dismissed.

(M. G. SEWLIKAR)
JUDGE

dyb