

(2023) 05 GUJ CK 0045
In the Gujarat High Court
Case No : R/Criminal Appeal No. 1039 Of 2023

Ajitsinh @ Ajaysinh Shivubha Rathod

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-05-2023

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 438
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 114, 323, 386, 452, 504, 506(2)
Scheduled Caste And Scheduled Tribe (Prevention Of Atrocities) Act, 1989 — Section 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v)
Gujarat Money Lenders Act, 2011 — Section 5, 40, 42

Citation : (2023) 05 GUJ CK 0045

Hon'ble Judges : M. R. Mengdey, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Ashish M Dagli, Malay Patel, Jigar L Patel, Jirga Jhaveri

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

M. R. Mengdey, J

1. By way of the present application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the applicants-accused has prayed for anticipatory bail in connection with the FIR being C.R. No.1 1 2 0 8 0 4 5 2 3 0 2 7 6 / 2 0 2 3 registered with Malaviyanagar Police Station, Rajkot for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 386, 452, 504, 506(2) and 114 of the Indian Penal Code, Sections 3(1)(r) and 3(2)(v) of Prevention of Atrocities Act and Sections 5, 40 and 42 of the Gujarat Money Lending Act.

2. Learned advocate for the applicants submits that the alleged incident took place on 15.03.2023, whereas FIR came to be registered on 18.03.2023. Therefore, there is 3 days delay in lodging the FIR. It is submitted that parties have settled the dispute inter se amicably and the first informant has no objection, if the present application is allowed.

3. Learned advocate for the applicants has submitted that the applicants are

apprehending his arrest in connection the aforesaid FIR and in this connection the earlier application filed by the applicant before the learned Sessions Court came to be dis-allowed. Learned Advocate for the applicants has submitted that just to give criminal colour, a false and frivolous complaint is created to pressurize the present applicant, and therefore, the present application may kindly be allowed.

4. Learned advocate for the applicants has further argued that the applicant will keep themselves available during the course of investigation and trial also and will not flee from justice.

5. Learned advocate for the applicants on instructions states that the applicants are ready and willing to abide by all the conditions including imposition of conditions with regard to powers of Investigating Agency to file an application before the competent Court for his remand. He further submitted that upon filing of such application by the Investigating Agency, the right of applicants accused to oppose such application on merits may be kept open. Learned advocate, therefore, submitted that considering the above facts, the applicants may be granted anticipatory bail.

6. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State has opposed grant of anticipatory bail looking to the nature and gravity of the offence.

Learned APP has submitted that the investigation be continued.

7. Learned advocate for the respondent no.2 states that the dispute has been settled between the parties. The affidavit of the first informant in that regard is placed on record. He, therefore, submitted to pass an appropriate order considering the fact that the matter is settled between the parties.

8. Having heard the arguments advanced by the learned advocates for the parties and perusing the material placed on record and taking into consideration the facts of the case, nature of allegations, gravity of offences, role attributed to the accused and also considering the fact that the matter has been settled between the parties, without discussing the evidence in detail, at this stage, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicants.

9. This Court has considered following aspects,

(a) as per catena of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court there are mainly two factors which are required to be considered by this Court;

(b) prima facie case.

(c) requirement of accused for custodial interrogation.

Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, this court is inclined to consider the case of the applicants.

10. This Court has also taken into consideration the law laid down by the Hon'ble

Apex Court in the case of Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors., reported at [2011] 1 SCC 694, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court reiterated the law laid down by the Constitution Bench in the case of Shri Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab, reported at (1980) 2 SCC 565. Further, this Court has also taken into consideration the ratio laid down in the case of Sushila Aggarwal and Ors. v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr. in Special Leave Petition No. 7281-7282/2017 dated 29.01.2020.

11. In the result, the present application is allowed. The applicants are ordered to be released on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with FIR being C.R. No.1 1 2 0 8 0 4 5 2 3 0 2 7 6 / 2 0 2 3 registered with Malaviyanagar Police Station, Rajkot on executing a personal bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) each with one surety of like amount on the following conditions:

(a) shall cooperate with the investigation and make available for interrogation whenever required;

(b) shall remain present at concerned Police Station on 15.05.2023 between 12.00 Noon and 2.00 p.m.;

(c) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the fact of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer;

(d) shall not obstruct or hamper the police investigation and not to play mischief with the evidence collected or yet to be collected by the police;

(e) shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the investigating officer and the court concerned and shall not change his residence till the final disposal of the case till further orders;

(f) shall not leave India without the permission of the concerned trial court and if having passport shall deposit the same before the concerned trial court within a week; and

(g) it would be open to the Investigating Officer to file an application for remand if he considers it proper and just and the learned Magistrate would decide the remand application without being influenced of the observations made by this Court;

12. The applicants shall remain present before the learned Magistrate on the first date of hearing of such application and on all subsequent occasions, as may be directed by the learned Magistrate. This would be sufficient to treat the accused in the judicial custody for the purpose of entertaining application of the prosecution for police remand. This is, however, without prejudice to the right of the accused to seek stay against an order of remand, if, ultimately, granted, and the power of the learned Magistrate to consider such a request in accordance with law. It is clarified that the applicants, even if, remanded to the police custody, upon completion of such period of police remand, shall be set free

immediately, subject to other conditions of this anticipatory bail order.

13. At the trial, the concerned trial court shall not be influenced by the prima facie observations made by this Court in the present order.

14. Rule is made absolute. Direct service is permitted.