

(2021) 01 GUJ CK 0016
In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : R/Criminal Misc.Application No. 1089 Of 2021

Ashishkumar Babulal Vasava

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 25-01-2021

Acts Referred:

Gujarat Prohibition Act, 1949 — Section 65(E)
Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 438

Citation : (2021) 01 GUJ CK 0016

Hon'ble Judges : Rajendra M. Sareen, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Vicky B Mehta, Dharmesh Devnani

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Rajendra M. Sareen, J

RULE. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor waives service of notice of rule on behalf of the respondent-State.

[1] By way of the present application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the applicant original accused has prayed to release

him on anticipatory bail in case of his arrest in connection with the FIR registered as C.R No.11214068200997 of 2020 before Kim Police Station,

District: Surat Rural for the offences punishable under section 65-E of the Prohibition Act.

[2] Learned advocate for the applicant submits that only two antecedents are registered against the present applicant and he is falsely implicated in the

present offence. Learned advocate for the applicant on instructions also states that the applicant is ready and willing to abide by all the conditions

including imposition of condition with regard to power of investigating agency to

file an application before the competent Court for his remand. He has further submitted that upon filing such application by the investigating agency, the right of the applicant- accused to oppose such application on merits may be kept open. He submits that considering the nature of allegations, role attributed to the applicant, the applicant may be enlarged on anticipatory bail by imposing suitable conditions.

[3] 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.

[4] Heard the learned Advocates for the respective parties through Video Conferencing and perused the papers.

[5] Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record of the case and taking into consideration the facts that only two

antecedents are registered against the present applicant and he is falsely implicated in the present offence, nature of allegations, role attributed to the

accused, without discussing the evidence in detail, at this stage, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant. This Court has also taken into

consideration the law laid down by the Honâ??ble Apex Court in the case of Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors. as

reported at [2011] 1 SCC 6941, wherein the Honâ??ble Apex Court reiterated the law laid down by the Constitutional Bench in the case of Shri

Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia & Ors., as reported at (1980) 2 SCC 665.

[6] In the result, the present application is allowed by directing that in the event of applicant herein being arrested pursuant to FIR registered as C.R

No.11214068200997 of 2020 before Kim Police Station, District: Surat Rural, the applicant shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond of

Rs. 15,000/-(Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) with one surety of like amount on the following conditions that the applicant shall :

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

(b) remain present at concerned Police Station on 01.02.2021 between 11.00 a.m. and 2.00 p.m.;

(c) not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the fact of the case so as to dissuade from

disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer;

(d) 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) at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the investigating officer and the court concerned and shall not change residence till the final

disposal of the case till further orders;

(f) not leave India without the permission of the Court and if having passport shall deposit the same before the 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 it on merits;

[7] Despite this order, it would be open for the Investigating Agency to apply to the competent Magistrate, for police remand of the applicant. The

applicant 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 applicant, 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.

[8] At the trial, the Trial Court shall not be influenced by the prima facie observations made by this Court while enlarging the applicant on anticipatory

bail.

[9] Rule is made absolute. Application is disposed of accordingly. Registry is directed to communicate this order by FAX or E-mail to the concerned

Authority.