
(2021) 08 SHI CK 0151

In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous Petition (Main) No.1556, 1557 Of 2021

Anamika Autka And Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of H.P

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 13-08-2021

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2021) 08 SHI CK 0151

Hon'ble Judges : Sandeep Sharma, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : T.K. Verma, Hemant Thakur, Sudhir Bhatnagar, Desh Raj Thakur, R.P. Singh, Narinder Thakur

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Sandeep Sharma, J

1. Since both the bail petitions arise out of same FIR, they were taken up for hearing together and are being disposed of vide this common judgment.
2. By way of present bail petitions filed under S. 438 CrPC, prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail by the bail petitioners in FIR No. 52, dated 31.7.2021 under Ss. 448, 451, 436, 341, 504, 506 and 34 IPC registered at Police Station new Shimla, district Shimla, Himachal Pradesh.
3. Status report stands filed by the respondent State in terms of order dated 9.8.2021.
4. Mr. Sudhir Bhatnagar, learned Additional Advocate General, while fairly admitting the factum with regard to joining of investigation by both the petitioners, contends that though nothing remains to be recovered from them, but keeping in view the gravity of the offence alleged to have been committed by them, they do not deserve any leniency. However, learned

Additional Advocate General submits that in case this court intends to enlarge the bail petitioners on bail, strict conditions may be imposed upon them.

5. Hon'ble Apex Court and this Court in a catena of cases have repeatedly held that one is deemed to be innocent, till the time, he/she is proved guilty

in accordance with law. In the case at hand, complicity, if any, of the bail petitioners is yet to be established on record by the investigating agency, as

such, this Court sees no reason to let the bail petitioners incarcerate in jail for an indefinite period during trial, especially when nothing remains to be

recovered from them and they have joined the investigation. Apprehension expressed by learned Additional Advocate General, that in the event of

being enlarged on bail, bail petitioners may flee from justice or indulge in such offences again, can be best met by putting them to stringent conditions.

6. Hon'ble Apex Court in Criminal Appeal No. 227/2018, Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr decided on 6.2.2018 has held that freedom

of an individual can not be curtailed for indefinite period, especially when his/her guilt is yet to be proved. It has further held by the Hon'ble Apex

Court in the aforesaid judgment that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty.

7. Hon'ble Apex Court in Sanjay Chandra versus Central Bureau of Investigation (2012)1 Supreme Court Cases 49 has held that gravity alone

cannot be a decisive ground to deny bail, rather competing factors are required to be balanced by the court while exercising its discretion. It has been

repeatedly held by the Hon'ble Apex Court that object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount

of bail. The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative.

8. In Manoranjana Singh alias Gupta versus CBI, (2017) 5 SCC 218, Hon'ble Apex Court has held that the object of the bail is to secure the attendance

of the accused in the trial and the proper test to be applied in the solution of the question whether bail should be granted or refused is whether it is

probable that the party will appear to take his trial. Otherwise also, normal rule is of bail and not jail. Apart from above, Court has to keep in mind

nature of accusations, nature of evidence in support thereof, severity of the punishment, which conviction will entail, character of the accused,

circumstances which are peculiar to the accused involved in that crime.

9. The Apex Court in Prasanta Kumar Sarkar versus Ashis Chatterjee and another

(2010) 14 SCC 496, has laid down various principles to be kept in mind, while deciding petition for bail viz. prima facie case, nature and gravity of accusation, punishment involved, apprehension of repetition of offence and witnesses being influenced.

10. In view of above, bail petitioners have carved out a case for themselves, as such, present petitions are allowed. Orders dated 9.8.2021 are made

absolute, subject to the bail petitioners furnishing fresh bail bonds in the sum of Rs.20,000/- each with one local surety in the like amount, to the

satisfaction of the investigating officer, besides the following conditions:

(a) They shall make themselves available for the purpose of interrogation, if so required and regularly attend the trial Court on each and every date of

hearing and if prevented by any reason to do so, seek exemption from appearance by filing appropriate application;

(b) They shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence nor hamper the investigation of the case in any manner whatsoever;

(c) They shall not make any inducement, threat or promises to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from

disclosing such facts to the Court or the Police Officer; and

(d) They shall not leave the territory of India without the prior permission of the Court.

11. It is clarified that if the petitioners misuse the liberty or violates any of the conditions imposed upon them, the investigating agency shall be free to

move this Court for cancellation of the bail.

12. Any observations made hereinabove shall not be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case and shall remain confined to the disposal of

these petitions alone.

The petitions stand accordingly disposed of. Copy dasti.