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

***CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.687 OF 2015***

Rizwana Mohammad Sharique Qureshi ...Applicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Sudhir C. Halli, for the Applicant.

Mr. P.H.Gaikwad-Patil, A.P.P for the Respondent – State.

***CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.***

***DATE : 18th JUNE, 2021***

***(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)***

***P.C. :***

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. By this application, the applicant has sought the following substantive prayers:-

"9 (b) That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased, after going into the legality, propriety and substantivity of the case, to set-aside, cancel the bail granted to Respondent No.2 in Bail Application No.2350 of 2015 by order dated 04/09/202015 passed by Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai ;

(c) That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased, after going

into the legality, propriety and substantivity of the case, to set-aside, cancel the Anticipatory Bail granted to Respondent No.3 to 5 by order dated 04/09/2015 passed in Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1976 of 2015 by Ld.Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai. ”

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the allegations as against the respondents are serious and that the police have not investigated the matter properly. He submits that having regard to the serious allegations the regular bail granted to the respondent No.2 be cancelled and so also the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent Nos.3 to 5, be cancelled.

4. Perused the papers including the impugned orders granting regular bail to the respondent No.2 and anticipatory bail granted to the respondent Nos.3 to 5. Respondent No.2 is the husband of the applicant and respondent Nos.3 to 5 the in-laws. The offences as alleged against the said respondents are under Sections 498A, 307, 354, 406, 324, 504, 506 II r.w. 34 of the Indian Penal Code. It appears that the respondent No.2 was granted regular bail and respondent Nos.3 to 5 were granted pre-arrest bail by the trial Court. The trial of the respondents has commenced, inasmuch as, charge has been framed as against the aforesaid respondents.

5. Having perused the impugned orders both dated 4th September 2015, no infirmity can be found in the said orders, warranting interference in the same.

6. The application is accordingly dismissed.

***REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.***