

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 601 OF 2025

Krishnakumar Ramvinas Sharma ...Applicant
Vs.

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. P. K. Sanghrajka	Advocate for the Applicant
Ms. S. E. Phad	APP for the Respondent-State

CORAM : S. M. MODAK, J.

DATE : 03rd JULY 2025

P. C. :-

1. Heard learned Advocate for the Applicant.
2. The Applicant is granted bail in connection with the offence registered with Amboli Police Station for offence punishable under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code. The amount of bail is Rs. 25,000/- alongwith one or two sureties. This order is passed on 26.09.2024 by the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, Greater Mumbai. Somehow, the Applicant could not arrange for surety and that is why the request is made to the concerned Court to

grant him cash surety. It was also granted. He applied for extension of time to furnish surety; however, it was rejected on 21.04.2025.

3. This application is for continuing the cash surety till conclusion of the trial. The learned Advocate tries to impress upon me how it is justified and how it is difficult for the Applicant to furnish for surety at Mumbai because he is resident of Delhi. He has also quoted one conduct of the Applicant in surrendering even though wrongly granted bail at Delhi.

4. As against this, the learned APP submitted that the Applicant was arrested in different States and his presence has to be secured and that is why surety is required.

5. Considering the above submissions, I am not inclined to accept the prayer. So, six weeks time is granted from today to furnish surety as directed by the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge vide the order dated 26.09.2024.

6. The Criminal Application is disposed of accordingly.

[S. M. MODAK, J.]