

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

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO.2405 OF 2022
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.811 OF 2021**

Jayesh Ramesh Khopkar Applicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra Respondent

Mr. Nikhil P. Mallelwar, Advocate i/b. Sachin Pawar, for the Applicant.

Smt. J.S. Lohokare, APP for the Respondent-State.

**CORAM :SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.
DATE : 25th JULY, 2022**

P.C. :

1. Vide order dated 18.1.2022 passed in Criminal Application No.2385/2021 in Criminal Appeal No.811/2021, this Court (Coram: Prakash D. Naik, J.) had granted bail to the applicant during pendency of Criminal Appeal No.811/2021. The applicant was permitted to furnish cash bail security of Rs.20,000/- for a period of ten weeks in lieu of surety. The applicant has not been able to furnish the surety as directed by Clause (ii) of the operative portion,

PRADIPKUMAR
PRAKASHRAO
DESHMANE

Digitally signed by
PRADIPKUMAR
PRAKASHRAO
DESHMANE
Date: 2022.07.26 17:06:37
+0530

which mentions that he was directed to be released on bail on executing P.R. bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/- with one or more sureties in the like amount.

2. Present application is for extension of time to furnish sureties.

3. Heard Shri Nikhil Mallelwar, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. J.S. Lohokare, learned APP for the State.

4. In paragraph-4 of the application, it is mentioned that the applicant had tried to arrange for the surety and he was able to arrange one surety, but, that person backed out at the last moment and, therefore, he could not arrange the sureties immediately. Learned counsel for the applicant further states that due to his poor financial condition, the applicant has not been able to furnish the cash bail security as was directed.

5. In this view of the matter, considering the earlier order passed and also taking into account the fact that the applicant has approached this Court for extension of the

period, I am inclined to extend that period for the reasons mentioned in paragraphs-4 & 5 of the application. Taking lenient view because of his financial condition and since the applicant has approached this Court for extension of time to furnish surety, said time is extended.

6. The application therefore is allowed. Time to furnish surety is extended by a period of two weeks from today. However, this order will not remain in force after two weeks from today and if he fails to furnish the sureties, as directed, he will have to surrender before the authorities. The application is disposed of accordingly.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)