

MHAU080000022018



Presented on : 01.01.2018  
Registered on : 01.01.2018  
Decided On : 05.09.2020  
Duration : 02Y.08M.04D.

**THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS,**  
**SILLOD, AT :- SILLOD**  
**( Presided over P. L. Patil )**

**R. C. C. No. :- 01/2018**  
**CNR MHAU08-000002-2018**

**Exh.No. :- 56.**

The State of Maharashtra.  
Through P.S.O. Sillod City Police Station.  
Sillod, Tq. Sillod, Dist. Aurangabad.

... **Prosecution.**

- **Versus** -

1. Dipak Shankar Apar,  
Age:- 27 yrs, Occu.:- Agri.,  
R/o Balaji Nagar Sillod, Tq. Sillod,  
Dist. Aurangabad.
2. Shankar Raghunath Apar,  
Age:- 60 yrs, Occu.:- Agri.,
3. Shashikala Shankar Apar,  
Age:- 55 yrs, Occu.:- Agri.,  
All R/o Balaji Nagar Sillod, Tq. Sillod,  
Dist. Aurangabad.

... **Accused.**

**FOR OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTION 498 (A)**  
**READ WITH 34 OF INDIAN PENAL CODE, 1860.**

---

**Appearance:-**

Shri. A. K. Pacharne :- Learned APP for the State.

Shri. V. I. Mandlecha :- Learned Advocate for accused

---

**J U D G M E N T**

(Delivered on 05.09.2020)

Accused are facing trial for the offence punishable under Section 498(A) read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code 1860.

**2. It is the case of prosecution that :-**

On 24.12.2016 informant solemnized marriage with accused No.1 as per Hindu rites and rituals. In the said marriage the parents of informant gave an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- for purchasing golden ornaments and other household articles. An amount of Rs.5,00,000/- was given as by way of dowry. On solemnization of marriage Informant went to Sillod. Where she resided for two days. As per rites, informant went to her parents house. Thereafter, she was brought to her matrimonial house.

3. However, accused abused informant contending that, in marriage no sufficient food was given to relatives. They gave mental and physical harassment to informant contending that, why they inquired about to accused prior to their marriage. They used to beat and abuse her. They keep the informant on starvation. On 21.01.2017, father of informant gave furniture of an amount of Rs.2,00,000/- and an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was given to accused no.2 through RTGS.

4. Informant resided at Sonai village, till April 2017. Where she was kept on starvation and beat her. Thereby she was mentally and physically

harassed. On 30.07.2017, she was thrown out of house to bring money from her parents. On 21.10.2017 accused went to the house of informant's parents, where they demanded money, if they want to sent informant for cohabitation. At that time accused abused to her parents. Therefore, informant lodged report with Sillod City Police station for offence punishable under Section 498-A, 323, 504, 506 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.

5. Investigating officer Shri. Y. S. Gavate on completion of investigation filed report against accused for punishable under Section 498-A, 323, 504, 506 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860. The learned predecessor of this court framed charge against accused persons for punishable under Section 498-A read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860. Accused plead not guilty. They denied charge and claimed to be tried.

6. Prosecution has examined PW No.1 Bajirao Daud (Exh.18), PW No.2 Santosh Daud (Exh.19), PW No.3 Pooja Apar, informant (Exh.21), PW No.4 Subhash Daud (Exh.31), PW No.5 Kiran Bavaskar (Exh.40) and PW No.6 Yuvaraj Gavate, Investigating Officer (Exh.47). On completion of prosecution evidence the statement of accused persons under Section 313 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, recorded below Exh.51-53. The defence of an accused is of total denial and false case has been filed against them.

7. Prosecution has relied upon Report (Exh.22), Letter issued to Sillod City Police Station dated 21.11.2017 (Exh.23), Marriage invitation card (Exh.24), Photographs Article A, Bill issued by Swastik Lawns (Exh.32), RTGS acknowledgements (Exh.33, 34, 35 and 36 respectively), Four bills issued by Ajubai cloth center, Bill issued by Mahavir fine cloth center and Raj cloth stores (Exh.37)

8. On perusal of oral and documentary evidence on record and after hearing arguments of both the parties, following points arise for my determination. I have recorded my findings thereon for the reasons given below :-

<b>Sr.</b>	<b><u>POINTS.</u></b>	<b><u>FINDINGS.</u></b>
1)	Does the prosecution prove that, on 01.01.2017 till 21.11.2017 at the residence situated at Balaji Nagar Sillod, accused No.1 being of husband of informant and accused No.2 and 3 being relatives of accused No.1 in furtherance of their common intention subjected informant to cruelty by giving mental and physical harassment for illegal demand of an amount of Rs.10,00,000/- for purchasing car and thereby accused have committed an offence punishable under Section498-A read with Section34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ?	...IN NEGATIVE
2)	What order?	... AS PER FINAL ORDER

### **REASONS**

9. Admittedly, in a criminal prosecution, the prosecution has to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt. Further, Case is to be decided on material available on record. It is settled principle that, court should not go beyond the record. By keeping this aspect in mind I am appreciating evidence as under,

10. **As to Point No.1 :-**

To prove the offence punishable under Section 498-A (1) of Indian Penal Code, 1860, the prosecution has to satisfy the essential ingredients mentioned below

Whoever, being husband or relative of husband of woman subject such woman to cruelty viz.

- A) Willful conduct is of such nature to drive the woman to commit suicide or cause grave injury to life or other of woman,
- B) Harassment of woman with a view
  - a. to coercing her or any person related to her to meet unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or
  - b. is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand.

11. Informant set the criminal law in motion. Therefore, it is necessary to see evidence of informant, PW3. Informant deposed that, accused no.1 is her husband and accused no.2 and 3 are his relatives. The relationship between accused themselves and with informant is not disputed. On 24.12.2016 informant solemnized marriage with accused no.1. Thereafter, informant went to her matrimonial house. She deposed that from the second day of marriage accused started to taunt her on ground that in marriage no sufficient food was given to relatives and why the parents of informant inquired about to accused on receiving unknown letter prior to marriage?

12. Learned advocate for accused cross examined PW3 informant at length. She deposed that, she has completed B. Sc., D. ED. She was doing job at Little wonder school, Sillod. She is having three sisters and one brother. She does not know, what job the husband of her elder sister does. She denied that,

husband of her elder sister used to drive Black and yellow car. She does not know, whether name of her father is mentioned in Ration Card for below poverty line. She does not know, whether her name is removed from said ration card. She denied that her father doing work in Kerosene Agency.

13. In report informant stated that, she resided in her matrimonial house for two days after the marriage. Thereafter, her brother and Sister's husband came to get her to her parents house. In evidence of chief informant has not deposed about how many days she was at her matrimonial house after marriage and she has not deposed when she went to her parents house with her brother and Sister's husband. She stated in report that, thereafter accused no.1 brought her to matrimonial house. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, when new bride after marriage went to her matrimonial house at that time one of female relative always go with the bride as custom. Prosecution has not brought anything on record about said female relative of informant. The said female relative was important witness. Prosecution has not examined her. Further, learned advocate for accused submitted that generally after marriage bride and bridegroom could not get time to have conversation with each other, because there are relatives in the house.

14. Informant deposed that, accused harassed her on the count that why parents of informant inquired upon receiving unknown letter. The said letter was received prior to marriage. However, learned advocate for accused submitted that, the said alleged letter is not produced on record. Informant has not deposed anything about the contents in the said alleged letter. The alleged letter is with the parents of informant, therefore there was no any difficulty to them to produce the same on record. PW4 is the father and PW5 is Sister's husband of informant (PW3). PW4 and PW5 have not deposed anything about

the alleged letter. There is no any record to show accused are acquainted with alleged letter and contents of it. Informant has not stated in her report about to letter and contents of it. Therefore, learned advocate for accused submitted that, there is no question to harass informant for the same.

15. Informant deposed that, accused taut her on the ground that, in marriage no sufficient food was provided to relatives. PW4 deposed that accused harassed informant on ground that no sufficient food was given in marriage. He stated that informant said this fact to him when she was returned after two days of her marriage. PW5 deposed that accused harassed informant because the relatives in marriage could not get lunch neatly and no respect was given in marriage. He deposed that informant said this fact when she came to her parents house after one or one and half months of marriage.

16. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, no any witnessed deposed in the evidence that there was insufficient food in the marriage. He submitted that, informant has not deposed what accused exactly said to her as alleged tauts on the alleged ground of providing insufficient food to relatives. He submitted that, neither informant nor PW4 or PW5 have deposed specifically. The evidence of PW4 and PW5 are not corroborating to each other. Learned advocate for accused submitted that informant has not deposed that she stated to PW4 and PW5. PW4 and PW5 have not deposed exactly what accused allegedly said to informant. Bare contentions as to alleged tauts are not sufficient. Witnesses have to depose specifically what was allegedly said to her. He submitted that in the absence of it, the evidence of informant appears to be vague.

17. PW4 deposed that, mediators of marriage convinced to accused

and thereafter he sent the informant to her matrimonial house. Further, PW5 has deposed that relatives mediated and thereafter informant was sent to cohabitation. On the other hand informant stated in her report that accused no.1 brought her to matrimonial house. Further, informant has not stated anything about alleged mediation through the relatives and thereafter she was sent to cohabitation. Neither PW4 nor PW5 have deposed the names of alleged mediators. Therefore, learned advocate for accused submitted that the contentions as to mediation is not reliable.

18. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, PW5 deposed different story. PW4 deposed that PW3 informed to him when she was returned after three days of her marriage. PW5 deposed that, informant was returned to her parents house after one month or one and half month of her marriage at that time she was informed to him. Therefore, Learned advocate for accused submitted that the evidence of PW4 and PW5 are not corroborating to each other. Informant has not stated that she was informed to her father and Sister's husband about alleged taunts. PW4 and PW5 are father and Sister's husband of informant. They are close relatives of informant. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, for any woman her mother or sister is the best person to open her mind. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, it is strange in the present case the father and Sister's husband stated that informant told to them about alleged taunts, instead of her mother and sister. Prosecution has not examined the mother and sisters of informant as witness in the present case.

19. Informant deposed in examination in chief that, on 21.01.2017 her father gave an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- to accused no.2 through RTGS for furniture. Thereafter, she went to Village Sonai, where accused harassed her



for furniture, therefore, her father had given an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- in cash. However, on the contrary, in report (Exh.22) informant has not stated about any alleged demand of money by accused for furniture and harassment for the same. She stated in her report that, her father had given furniture of an amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- and an amount of Rs, 1,00,000/- was given by RTGS. The contention in report and in the evidence are contradictory to each other. In report informant has not stated that accused have made any demand of money for furniture. In report informant stated one thing and in examination in chief she deposed other thing. Report is not corroborating to the version of informant in her evidence.

20. PW4 deposed that accused made demand of Rs.2,00,000/- for furniture. Therefore, he paid Rs.1,00,000/- through RTGS and Rs.1,00,000/ by cash. He has produced on record the RTGS receipt of payment of Rs. 1,00,000/- to accused no.2. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, accused no.1 has paid the amounts of bills of PW4 through his credit card because on 08.11.2016 the government declared ban on currency notes and at the relevant time the transactions in cash of an amount above Rs.10,000/- was not permissible or made. PW3 deposed that currency notes were banned prior to her engagement dated 25.11.2016. PW4 and PW6 admitted that on November 2016 the currency notes were banned in India. The PW3 and PW4 admitted during their cross examination that accused no.1 has paid their bills through his credit card. However, they further deposed that, they have given money in advance to accused.

21. However, they have not produced any document on record to show that prior to payment of bill by accused no.1 through his credit card, the PW4 has paid the money to accused in advance. Learned advocate for accused

submitted PW3 or PW4 have not produced any document to show that they have paid money to accused in advance. There was no any difficulty to PW4 to produce document to that effect. The version of payment of money in cash to accused prior to payment of bill through credit card is not acceptable because at the relevant time there were deficiency of money in market. PW4 has not stated in his statement recorded during investigation about alleged demand of money for furniture and alleged payment of money through RTGS and by cash. Therefore, it could not be presumed through RTGS receipt Exh. 36 that PW4 has paid the money towards the furniture.

22. However, informant stated in report that, thereafter she was residing at Sonai till April 2017, where accused beat her and kept her on starvation thereby they harass her for furniture. On 30.07.2017, accused no.1 and 2 beat her, demanded money and throw her out of house. Informant deposed in her examination in chief that, on April 2017 they went to Sonai. She was harassed for furniture. Therefore, PW4 has paid an amount Rs. 1,00,000/-. On 30/07/2017 accused throw her out of house. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, informant stated in her report that till April she resided at Sonai. On the contrary in evidence she deposed that she went to Sonai on April 2017. The version of PW3 is self contradictory.

23. PW4 has not stated in his statement about the alleged payment of money to accused for furniture. PW5 has not deposed anything about alleged demand of money for furniture. PW1 and PW2 have also not deposed about the alleged demand of money for furniture. Further they PW1. PW2 and PW5 have not deposed about payment of money to accused for furniture. They have not deposed about alleged harassment of informant for alleged demand of money for furniture. Learned advocate for accused submitted that PW4 has not

produced any document to show that he has paid money in cash to accused. Further, he has not produced any document to show that at relevant time he was having money with him. He submitted that PW4 being the father of informant deposing in her favour. Therefore, he submitted that, his evidence is not reliable. Informant PW3 and her father PW4 have not stated specifically when accused allegedly made demand of money for furniture. Further, they have not deposed what and when accused had done anything for alleged satisfaction of demand. Bare contentions without any specification are not reliable. The allegations as to demand of money for furniture appears to be vague.

24. Informant deposed during cross examination that she did not state to neighborers in the village Sonai and Sillod about the alleged harassment. Prior to marriage she does not have relatives at Sonai. She was residing in quarters at Sonai. Generally, if husband and his relatives harass any woman, then she would tell to the neighborers about harassment. In the present case though informant was residing at Sonai, District Ahmednagar. However, informant deposed that she did not state to anyone about alleged harassment to any neighborer. PW6 investigating officer has not inquired with the neighborers at Sonai and Sillod. He deposed that he has not recorded the statements of neighborers at Sillod and Sonai. No any reason given by Investigating officer for not making any inquiry with neighborers. She deposed that, on 30.07.2017 accused beat her and throw her out of house. Further, she has not stated that she was told to her parents about alleged demand of money. She deposed that she has not lodged any report thereafter.

25. Informant stated in report that on 30.07.2017 accused demanded money they beat her and throw her out of house. She stated in her report that

on 21.10.2017 accused were came to her parents house, they demanded the money otherwise said to get divorce. Thereafter, accused started to abuse her parents. However, in examination in chief informant deposed that on 30.07.2017 accused beat her and throw her out of house. On 21.10.2017, accused were came to her parents house and they demanded an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/-. She further, deposed that accused run to beat her mother and brother.

26. However, informant during her cross examination deposed that since 30.07.2017 she is residing at her parents house. On 18.09.2017 accused issued notice for restitution of conjugal rights. She replied to said notice on 3.11.2017, thereby she denied to cohabit with accused no.1. Thereafter, accused issued another notice to informant on 14.11.2017. She did not institute suit for restitution of conjugal rights. Accused instituted suit for restitution of conjugal rights. The said suit is instituted prior to lodging of report. She had filed an application for divorce. The same is withdrawn on 16.02.2018.

27. Learned advocate for accused submitted that as per prosecution case the informant was allegedly thrown out of house on 30.07.2017 with alleged demand of money and the report was lodged on 21.11.2017. Learned advocate for accused submitted that there is delay in lodging report. He submitted that if informant was thrown out of house with alleged demand of money, then informant might have lodged report as soon as she was allegedly thrown out of house. Learned advocate for accused submitted that informant has not given any satisfactory reason for delay in lodging report.

28. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, informant has not

stated specifically about alleged incident of 30.07.2017. She has not stated what was happened on that day. Contentions of informant are vague. During cross examination informant deposed that thereafter she has not lodged report against accused. Since 30.07.2017 informant residing with her parents. Informant admitted that, accused no.1 instituted suit for restitution of conjugal rights. The same is decreed. Accused no.1 gave notice to her for cohabitation. Informant replied in negative. Thereon accused no.1 again issued notice to informant. Therefore, learned advocate for accused submitted that, informant has lodged false report after notices issued to her.

29. However, informant deposed that, she had apprehension to her life therefore she could not lodge report. Prior to 30.07.2017 informant was residing at Sonai, District Ahmednagar. Thereafter, she started to reside with her parents. The present report is filed on 21.11.2017. Prosecution has not brought anything on record to show existence of circumstances thereby there was danger to the life of informant. Therefore, the reason given by informant is not reliable.

30. Informant stated that, she was thrown out of her house. However, PW4 deposed that, on 30.07.2017 accused were made demand of money of Rs. 10,00,000/- to informant, they harassed her. Therefore, she left house. Informant no were mentioned that, accused made any alleged demand of money for purchasing car before 21.10.2017 . Further, there are no previous contention of informant about alleged demand of money for purchasing car. PW4 and PW5 are not eye witnesses of alleged incident. Their evidence is of hearsay. PW4 is father and PW5 is Sister's husband of informant. They are close relatives of informant. Informant is not corroborating to PW4. Being close relatives of informant, evidence of PW4 requires corroboration by independent

witnesses.

31. PW4 and PW5 have not stated in their statement during investigation about alleged demand of money for purchasing car. There is no corroboration to the version of PW4. There are no previous allegation about alleged demand of money for purchasing car. PW5 has not stated specifically about the alleged demand of money. The evidence of PW5 is vague. PW4 and PW5 have not given any reason as to why the alleged thing is not mentioned in their statement during investigation. PW 1 and PW2 have not deposed anything about alleged demand of money for alleged purchasing car. They are not supporting to prosecution case. Further the other witnesses are not examined by prosecution. The other witnesses are given up by prosecution. Therefore, learned advocate for accused submitted that, contentions of PW4 is not reliable.

32. In report informant stated that, on 21.10.2017 accused had come to her parents house. They made demand of money otherwise said to get divorce. At that time they abused to informant and her parents. On the other hand during evidence informant deposed that, on that day accused came to her parents house. They made demand of Rs. 10,00,000/- for purchasing Baleno car. At that time accused run to beat her mother and brother. Informant admitted that she has not lodged report of alleged incident dated 21.10.2017.

33. Learned advocate for accused submitted that generally it would not happen the persons who wants money will go to the house of in law's and would make illegal demand of money for purchasing car. Therefore, learned advocate for accused submitted that version of informant that accused went to

her parents house to make alleged illegal demand of money for purchasing car is not reliable. Learned advocate for accused submitted the version of informant is variable. She firstly deposed that accused demanded money for furniture. Thereafter, she deposed that on 21.10.2017 accused made demand of Rs. 10,00,000/- for purchasing car. However, in report while recording of alleged incident of dated 21.10.2017 informant has not stated about alleged demand of Rs. 10,00,000/- for purchasing car. Further, informant no were stated about alleged demand of money for purchasing car prior to that. No reason given by informant for the same. On 30.07.2017 informant left her matrimonial house.

34. PW4 deposed that the name of informant is removed from the ration card used for below poverty line. Informant during her cross examination denied that husband of her sister used to drive black and yellow car. On the contrary PW4 deposed that, he does not know whether the husband of his elder daughter used to drive black and yellow car. PW4 deposed that, he had ration card of below poverty line. He admitted that name of informant is removed from the said ration card for below poverty line and for the same an application was made to Tahsildar, Sillod. Thereby learned advocate for accused tried to bring the financial condition of parents of informant.

35. On the contrary PW 3 deposed that, accused no.1 doing job in Sugar factory at Sonai. Accused no.2 is retired from agricultural department. Accused no.1 is having residential quarter. PW4 admitted that, accused no.1 is Engineer in factory at Sonai. He is doing job prior to his marriage. He deposed he does not know whether accused no.2 is retired from agricultural department. Accused no.1 paid the amount of bill (Exh. 37) having tin number

27080914420 through his credit card. Thereby learned advocate for accused tried to bring on record the good financial condition of accused.

36. Learned advocate for accused submitted that, prosecution has not produced the complaint made to Mediation center, Sillod. Therefore, it could not be gather what informant was stated in the said complaint. However, prosecution has produced the letter issued by mediation center, Sillod (Exh. 23). The said letter states that complaint was made to convince the accused as they harassing her and to cohabit with her. It further states that, accused persons were remain present. However, accused stated that until and unless the copy of complaint given to them, they will not remain present in the said proceeding. The said letter does not contain anything about alleged illegal demand of money for purchasing furniture or car. Further it does not state that accused were harassed her for satisfaction of it.

37. Informant stated is report that on 21.10.2017 accused abused her parents. She deposed that accused were run to beat her brother and mother. However, no reason assigned by informant and PW4 as to why they have not lodged report about alleged incident. Further the letter issued by the mediation center, Sillod does not contain that accused were gone to the informants parents house. Further it does not contain that accused run to beat informants mother and brother. It does not state accused abused her parents. There is no any document on record to show when informant approached to mediation center, Sillod.

38. Investigating officer has not examined mother and brother of informant as witness. No any independent witness adjacent to the house of PW4 is examined by the investigating officer in respect of alleged incident.



Investigating officer has not assigned any reason for non examining the said neighborers of PW4. However, PW4 has not lodged any report to that effect. No any reason given for not lodging any report of alleged incident. The other witnesses' viz. PW1, PW2, PW5 and PW6 have not deposed about alleged incident dated 21.10.2017. They are not corroborating to the PW4. No any independent witnesses deposed about the alleged incident dated 21.10.2017.

39. Learned Assistant public prosecutor submitted that the offence punishable under Section 498A of Indian Penal Code, 1860 would be committed with in the four walls of house. Therefore, the independent witness will not be available in such cases. Learned advocate for accused submitted that the evidence of witnesses on record is not reliable. PW3, PW4 and PW5 are close relatives of each other. PW3 and PW4 have not deposed specifically about the alleged incident. The evidence of PW3 is variable. PW4 and PW5 are not eye witnesses. Their evidence is hearsay evidence. PW3 has not deposed that she has stated about alleged allegations to PW4 and PW5. Investigating officer has not examined the mother and brother of informant. Further, investigating officer has not examined the female who had gone with the newly wedded bride immediately after marriage. The evidence of PW5 is vague. PW1 and PW2 are not supporting to prosecution case. The investigating officer deposed that names of witnesses were given by the father of informant. Learned advocate for accused submitted that informant lodged report after accused no.1 issued notices to her. However, the evidence of PW3 and PW4 appears not reliable. The evidence of PW 5 is vague. PW1 and PW2 are not supporting to prosecution case.

40. Learned Assistant public prosecutor relied on case law of Hon'ble Bombay High Court, reported in ALL M R (Cri) 320 in between Surendra

Pralhad Chikte and others Vs State of Maharashtra wherein it is held that, “making a demand of Rs, 40,000/- and giving threat of divorce for that purpose and quarreling with the deceased certainly amounts to harassment with in the meaning of Section 498A of IPC.” The facts of this case law are depend on the four dying declarations of deceased. The facts of this case law are different from the facts of present case. Therefore, this case law is not assisting to prosecution case.

41. Considering these facts and circumstances on record there are no corroborative evidence on record. The evidence on record does not inspire confidence. No specific role of the accused persons has been given. Informant and father of informant have not even lodged any report immediately after alleged incident which was certainly possible for them. In such circumstances the defence of the accused persons become probable. For all these reasons I hold that, allegations against accused are not proved beyond all reasonable doubts. Resultantly, I record my finding to point no. 1 in negative.

42. **As to Point No. 2 :-**

In view of negative finding of point no. 1 and for the reasons mentioned aforesaid allegations against accused are not proved beyond all reasonable doubt, therefore, all the accused are deserved to be acquitted, hence, I proceed to pass the following order. :

**ORDER**

1. Accused Nos. 1 to 3 are not found guilty and therefore, they are hereby acquitted vide Section 248(1) of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, for the offence punishable under Section 498-A read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. The bail bonds of all the accused shall stands canceled and sureties are discharged.
  
3. Accused Nos.1 to 3 shall furnish bail bond of Rs.15000/- (Rs. Fifteen thousand only) each as per Section 437-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973.

(JUDGMENT DICTATED AND PRONOUNCED IN A OPEN COURT.)

Date: 05.09.2020  
Place: Sillod.

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Sillod.

**CERTIFICATE**

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file Judgment are same, word to word, as per the original Judgment.

Name of the Stenographer : B. S. Jadhav

Court : Shri. P. L. Patil,  
Judicial Magistrate (F.C.), Sillod.

Date of Judgment : 05.09.2020

Judgment signed by the  
presiding officer on : 05.09.2020

Judgment uploaded on 08.09.2020