

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.3183 OF 2023**

Manjula Bholanath Singh .. Applicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra .. Respondent
...

Mr.Vishal Tiwari for the applicant.
Ms.Mahalaxmi Ganpathy, APP for the Respondent-State.
Mr.R.N. Loke, PSI, Sakinaka Pairavi officer.

**CORAM: BHARATI DANGRE, J.
DATED : 15th MARCH 2024**

P.C:-

1 The applicant faces accusations under Section 304-B, 498-A, 306 and 504 r/w 34 of IPC in CR. No.1241 of 2021.

 He approached this Court by filing Anticipatory Bail Application No.112 of 2021, which was decided on merits and this Court (Sarang Kotwal J.) by recording the prima facie involvement of the applicant, deemed it proper to reject the application. He specifically focused upon the allegations levelled against the applicant that the deceased was harassed because she was unable to fulfill the unlawful demands and his conduct was of such a nature that it caused deceased Jyoti to commit suicide.

2 Upon the rejection of the application, the applicant once again approached this Court by filing Anticipatory Bail Application No.1996 of 2022 and on 22/07/2022, on noting that

the investigation was complete and the charge sheet is filed, the applicant was directed to approach the Sessions Court and the application was disposed off.

3 Once again the applicant approached the Sessions Court by filing Anticipatory Bail Application No.1383 of 2022, which is rejected by order dated 7/10/2022, by the Sessions Court at Dindoshi, Borivali Division with a finding recorded that the offence is serious and the applicant faces accusations of demanding dowry and abating the suicide by Jyoti his wife.

4 It was clearly recorded that it is the case of custodial interrogation and though the High Court had rejected the Anticipatory Bail Application, the applicant is not traceable and could not be arrested and is evading the arrest.

5 I cannot arrive at any different conclusion that the one, which is recorded in the previous orders and in any case there is no propriety in filing repeated Anticipatory Bail Applications, when the Court had clearly opined that, his custodial interrogation is necessary in the wake of the accusations that are levelled against him.

In the wake of the above, the application is rejected.

(SMT. BHARATI DANGRE, J.)