

(2022) 08 GUJ CK 0034

In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : R/Criminal Misc.Application No. 13715 Of 2022

Durgaben Harishbhai Makvana

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-08-2022

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 438
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 114, 306, 498A
Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 — Section 3, 7

Citation : (2022) 08 GUJ CK 0034

Hon'ble Judges : Nikhil S. Kariel, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Arvind K Thakur, Ronak Raval

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Nikhil S. Kariel, J

1. Heard learned Advocate Mr. Arvind Thakur on behalf of the applicant and learned Additional Public Prosecutor Mr. Ronak Raval on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned Advocate Mr. D.K. Trivedi would submit that he has instruction to appear on behalf of the first informant and that he may be permitted to file his Vakaltnama. Permission is granted.

2. Rule. Learned APP waives service of rule on behalf of the respondent-State.

3. By way of this application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the applicant – original accused prays for being released on anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 11191008220534 of 2022 registered with Chandkheda Police Station, District: Ahmedabad City on 04.07.2022 for offences punishable under Sections 306, 498A and 114 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 7 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. Learned Advocate submits the nature of allegations are such for which custodial interrogation at this stage may not be necessary. Besides, the applicant

is available during the course of investigation and will not flee from justice. In view of the above, the applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

Learned Advocate for the applicant on instructions states that the applicant is 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 would further submit that upon filing of such application by the Investigating Agency, the right of applicant-accused to oppose such application on merits may be kept open.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor and learned Advocate for the first informant opposed the grant of anticipatory bail looking to the nature and gravity of the offence.

6. Heard learned Advocates for the parties, who have not submitted anything else.

7. Considering the submission made by learned Advocates for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that a detailed discussion of the material on record is not necessary at this stage and whereas following relevant aspects have been considered by this Court :

[1] That the present applicant being a lady aged around 44 years and whereas there are no specific allegations against the present applicant whereas serious allegations being against the husband of the deceased i.e. the son of the present applicant.

[2] It also appears that the allegations against the present applicant are general in nature.

[3] It also appears that insofar as the allegation that the deceased was not being provided proper medical treatment by the family of the present applicant, there is material produced by the learned Advocate Mr. Thakur to show that the deceased was infact provided regular medical treatment.

[4] It also appears that there is no antecedent against the present applicant.

8. Having regard to the circumstances in question, and considering the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra and Ors. reported in (2011)1 SCC 694, this Court is inclined to consider this application.

9. In the result, the present application is allowed by directing that in the event of applicant herein being arrested pursuant to FIR No. 11191008220534 of 2022 registered with Chandkheda Police Station, District: Ahmedabad City the applicant shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with one surety of like amount, on the following conditions:

(a) shall cooperate with the investigation and make herself available for

interrogation whenever required;

(b) shall remain present at the concerned Police Station on 08.08.2022 between 11:00 a.m. 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 her 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 or till further orders;

(f) shall not leave India without the permission of the Court and, if having passports shall surrender the same before the Trial Court within a week.

10. Despite this order, it would be open for the Investigating Agency to file an application for police remand of the applicant to the competent Magistrate, if he thinks it just and proper and learned Magistrate would decide it on merits. 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.

11. At the trial, the Trial Court shall not be influenced by the prima facie observations made by this Court while enlarging the applicant on bail. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. Direct service is permitted.