

(2017) 01 GUJ CK 0008
In the Gujarat High Court
Case No : 35162? of 2016

RUPALBA @ KIRANBA RAVIRAJ SINH JADEJA

APPELLANT

Vs

STATE OF GUJARAT

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 06-01-2017

Acts Referred:

[Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973](#), [Section 438](#) - Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest
[Indian Penal Code, 1860](#), [Section 114](#),
[Section 306](#), [Section 498\(A\)](#) -
Abettor present when offence is committed - Abetment of Suicide - Enticing or taking away or detaining with criminal intent a married woman
[Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961](#), [Section 3](#),
[Section 4](#) - Penalty for giving or taking dowry - Penalty for demanding dowry

Citation : (2017) 01 GUJ CK 0008

Hon'ble Judges : A.Y. KOGJE

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : J M PANCHAL, ?K J PANCHAL, ?MOXA THAKKAR

Judgement

1. RULE. Learned APP Ms.Moxa Thakkar Oza waives service of Rule on behalf of the respondent-State.
2. This is an application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for anticipatory bail in the event of her arrest in connection with FIR registered at C.R. No.I-84 of 2016 before Limdi Police Station, District Surendranagar for the offence under Sections 306, 498(A) and 114 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the applicant would submit that considering the nature of offence, the applicant may be enlarged on anticipatory bail by imposing suitable conditions.

4. On the other hand, the learned APP appearing for the respondent-State has opposed this application and granting anticipatory bail to the applicant looking to the nature and gravity of the offence.

5. I have heard the learned Advocates appearing for the respective parties and perused the investigation papers and have also taken into consideration the facts of the case, nature of allegations, role attributed to the applicant- accused and 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 Hon''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 Hon''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. Following aspects are also considered:-

I. The applicant is sister-in-law of the deceased and on the same day, she was married and since then residing with her family at Rajkot.

II. The applicant being a lady accused, custodial interrogation may not be necessary.

7. Learned Advocate for the applicant on instructions states that the applicant is ready and willing to abide by all the conditions, including

impositions of conditions with regard to the 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.

8. In the result, the present application is allowed by directing that in the event of arrest of the applicant herein in connection with FIR registered at C.R. No.I-84 of 2016 before Limdi Police Station, District Surendranagar, the applicant shall be released on bail on her furnishing a personal bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousands only) with one surety of the like amount on the following conditions that she shall:

- (a) cooperate with the investigation and make himself available for interrogation whenever required;
- (b) remain present at the concerned Police Station on 10.01.2017 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 him/them 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 his 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 the same on merits;

9. 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.

10. 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 is made absolute.