

(2020) 08 GUJ CK 0040
In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : R/Criminal Misc.Application No. 10179 Of 2020

Pareshbhai Savjibhai Bhil

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-08-2020

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 438

Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 — Section 65A, 65(e), 98(2), 116(B)

Citation : (2020) 08 GUJ CK 0040

Hon'ble Judges : A.J.Desai, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Bhakti M Joshi, Krina Calla

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

A.J.Desai, J

1. By way of the present application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the applicant accused has prayed to release him on

anticipatory bail in case of his arrest in connection with the FIR registered at C.R. No.11198053200405 of 2020 registered with Talaja Police Station,

District Bhavnagar for the offences under Sections 65-A, 65(e), 116(B), 98(2) of the Prohibition Act.

2. Learned advocate for the applicant submits that the nature of allegations are such for which custodial interrogation at this stage is not 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.

3. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent â?" State has opposed grant of anticipatory bail looking to the nature and gravity of the offence.

4. Having heard the learned advocate for the parties and perusing the investigating papers and taking into consideration the facts of the case, nature of allegations, gravity of offences, role attributed to the accused and considering the fact that applicant is sought to be implicated on the basis of

statement of co-accused and the fact that the vehicle involved in the offence does not belong to the applicant, 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 694,1 wherein the

Honâ??ble Apex Court reiterated the law laid down by the Constitution Bench in the case of Shri Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia & Ors., as reported at

(1980) 2 SCC 665.

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

No.11198053200405 of 2020 registered with Talaja Police Station, District Bhavnagar, the applicant shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal

bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five Thousand Only) with one surety of like amount on the following conditions that he:

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

(b) shall remain present at the concerned Police Station on 08.08.2020 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 him

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 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;

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. Application is disposed of accordingly. Direct service is permitted. Registry to communicate this

order to the concerned Court/authority by Fax or Email forthwith.