

(2023) 02 P&H CK 0097

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous Petition (M) No. 9630 Of 2023 (O&M)

Mandeep @ Vishu @ Mandeep Kumar

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Punjab

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 23-02-2023

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 173, 319, 438, 446

Citation : (2023) 02 P&H CK 0097

Hon'ble Judges : Anoop Chitkara, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Dinesh Kumar, Virat Rana

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Anoop Chitkara, J

FIR No

Dated

Police Station

Sections

72

15.05.2021

Nangal, District Rupnaga

Earlier registered under Sections 302, 148, 149, 506 IPC now after detailed inquiry conducted by the S.P. dated 26.07.2021 and accepted by the Senior Superintendent of Police, offence has been converted and registered under Sections 304, 323, 506, 34 IPC, wherein the peonier has been summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C.

1. On being summoned by the trial court after allowing the complainant's

application under section 319 CrPC, the petitioner has come up before this court under section 438 CrPC, with further relief that on their appearance before the trial court, they be released on bail.

2. Petitioner's counsel argued that the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.

3. State's counsel opposes the bail. The contention on behalf of the complainant is that initially, because of an unfair investigation by the police, the petitioners were absolved, whereas their involvement in the crime stands substantiated by their summoning by the trial court.

REASONING:

4. The prosecution agencies did not consider it appropriate to arraign the petitioner as an accused. Thus, a view favouring the petitioner exists, and on this ground alone, the petitioner is entitled to bail. Even a prima facie perusal of paragraph 4 of the bail petition needs consideration for bail.

5. In *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v State of Punjab*, 1980 (2) SCC 565, (Para 30), a Constitutional Bench of Supreme Court held that the bail decision must enter the cumulative effect of the variety of circumstances justifying the grant or refusal of bail. In *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav*, 2005 (2) SCC 42, (Para 18) a three-member Bench of Supreme Court held that the persons accused of non-bailable offences are entitled to bail if the Court concerned concludes that the prosecution has failed to establish a prima facie case against him, or despite the existence of a prima facie case, the Court records reasons for its satisfaction for the need to release such person on bail, in the given fact situations. The rejection of bail does not preclude filing a subsequent application. The courts can release on bail, provided the circumstances then prevailing requires, and a change in the fact situation. In *State of Rajasthan v Balchand*, AIR 1977 SC 2447, (Para 2 & 3), Supreme Court noticeably illustrated that the basic rule might perhaps be tersely put as bail, not jail, except where there are circumstances suggestive of fleeing from justice or thwarting the course of justice or creating other troubles in the shape of repeating offences or intimidating witnesses and the like by the petitioner who seeks enlargement on bail from the Court. It is true that the gravity of the offence involved is likely to induce the petitioner to avoid the course of justice and must weigh when considering the question of bail. So also, the heinousness of the crime. In *Gudikan Narasimhulu v Public Prosecutor*, (1978) 1 SCC 240, (Para 16), Supreme Court held that the delicate light of the law favors release unless countered by the negative criteria necessitating that course. In *Prahlad Singh Bhanu v NCT, Delhi*, (2001) 4 SCC 280, Supreme Court highlighted one of the factors for bail to be the public or the State's immense interest and similar other considerations. In *Dataram Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh*, (2018) 3 SCC 22, (Para 6), Supreme Court held that the grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously,

compassionately, and in a humane manner. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.

6. The possibility of the accused tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses, and the likelihood of fleeing justice, can be taken care of by imposing elaborate and stringent conditions. In *Sushila Aggarwal*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions. In *Sumit Mehta v. State of N. C.T. of Delhi*, (2013)15 SCC 570, Para

11, Supreme Court holds that while exercising power Under Section 438 of the Code, the Court is duty-bound to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal freedom and the right of investigation of the police.

7. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail, subject to the following terms and conditions, which shall be over and above and irrespective of the contents of the form of bail bonds in chapter XXXIII of CrPC, 1973.

8. In *Mahidul Sheikh v. State of Haryana*, CRM-33030-2021 in CRA-S-363-2020, decided on 14-01-2022, Para 53, [Law Finder Doc Id # 1933969], this Court observed,

[53]. The pragmatic approach is that while granting bail with sureties, the "Court" and the "Arresting Officer" should give a choice to the accused to either furnish surety bonds or to handover a fixed deposit, or direct electronic money transfer where such facility is available, or creating a lien over his bank account. The accused should also have a further option to switch between the modes. The option lies with the accused to choose between the sureties and deposits and not with the Court or the arresting officer.

9. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, on appearance in the trial on the date fixed or any date before the next date, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, in the following terms:

(a). Petitioner to furnish personal bond of Rs. Ten thousand (INR 10,000/-); AND

(b) To give one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the concerned investigator/SHO. Before accepting the surety, the concerned officer must satisfy that if the accused fail to appear in court, then such surety can produce such accused before the court.

OR

(b) Petitioner to hand over to the concerned investigator/SHO a fixed deposit for Rs. Ten Thousand only (INR 10,000/-), with the clause of automatic renewal of the principal and the interest reverting to the linked account, made in favour of the

'Chief Judicial Magistrate' of the concerned district. The fixed deposit may be made from any of the banks where the stake of the State is more than 50% or any of the well-established and stable private sector banks. The fixed deposit need not necessarily be made from the petitioner's account.

(c). In case of the launching of the prosecution, the said fixed deposit be forwarded to the concerned court along with the police report/challan under 173 CrPC.

(d). Such court shall have a lien over the deposit until the case's closure, or discharged by substitution, or up to the expiry of the period mentioned under S. 437-A CrPC, 1973, and at that stage, subject to the proceedings under S. 446 CrPC, the entire amount of fixed deposit, less taxes if any, shall be endorsed/returned to the depositor.

(e). It shall be the discretion of the petitioner to cash fixed deposits. It shall also be open for the petitioner concerned court to substitute the fixed deposit with house between surety bonds and order to apply to the Investigator or the surety bonds and vice-versa.

(f). On the reverse page of personal bond, the petitioner shall mention her/his permanent address along with the phone number, preferably that numbers which is linked with the AADHAR, and e-mail (if any). In case of any change in the above particulars, the petitioner shall immediately and not later than 30 days from such modification intimate about the change to the concerned police station and the concerned court.

(g). The petitioner is to also execute a bond for appearance in the concerned court(s) as and when asked to do so. The presentation of the personal bond shall be deemed acceptance of the declarations made in the bail petition and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and also of this bail order.

10. The petitioner shall not influence, browbeat, pressurize, make any inducement, threat, or promise, directly or indirectly, to the witnesses, the Police officers, or any other person acquainted with the facts and the circumstances of the case, to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police, or the Court, or to tamper with the evidence.

11. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the merits of the case nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

12. In return for the protection from incarceration, the Court believes that the accused shall also reciprocate through desirable behavior.

13. The SHO of the concerned police station or the investigating officer shall arrange to send a copy of this order, preferably a soft copy, to the complainant and the victim, without any delay. If the victim(s) notice any violation of this order, they may inform the SHO of the concerned police station, the trial court, or even this court.

14. There would be no need for a certified copy of this order for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. In case the assessing officer wants to verify the authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for assessing bonds.

Petitioner allowed in aforesaid terms . All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.