

(2019) 11 MP CK 0129

In the Madhya Pradesh High Court

Case No : Miscellaneous Criminal Case No. 44424 Of 2019

Veerendra Singh Patel

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Madhya Pradesh

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 18-11-2019

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 41, 41A, 41(1), 41(1)(a), 41(1)(b), 41(1)(c), 41(1)(d), 41(1)(e), 438
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 420

Citation : (2019) 11 MP CK 0129

Hon'ble Judges : Sheel Nagu, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Anand Purohit, S.S. Rajput

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

This is first bail application u/S.438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant.

Petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with offence punishable u/S.420 IPC registered as Crime No.494/2019 at Police Station Maharajpura, Gwalior (M.P.).

Learned Public Prosecutor for the State opposed the application and prayed for its rejection by contending that on the basis of the allegations and the material available on record, no case for grant of bail is made out.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest on the allegation of cheating arising out of the fact of petitioner having alienated the land, which actually belonged to the government.

After having heard learned counsel for the rival parties, this Court is of the considered opinion that the offence of cheating appears to be prima facie made out and therefore this Court declines grant of anticipatory bail.

However, looking to the fact that since the offence in question attracts

punishment upto 7 years and therefore, in view of the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273, It is directed that in offences involving punishment upto seven years imprisonment the police may resort to the extreme step of arrest only when the same is necessary and the petitioner does not cooperate in the investigation. The petitioner should first be summoned to cooperate in the investigation. If the petitioner cooperates in the investigation then the occasion of his arrest should not arise.

For ready reference and convenience the guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of Arnesh Kumar (Supra) are enumerated below:-

7.1 From a plain reading of the provision u/S.41 Cr.P.C., it is evident that a person accused of an offence punishable with imprisonment for a term which may be less than seven years or which may extend to seven years with or without fine, cannot be arrested by the police officer only on his satisfaction that such person had committed the offence punishable as aforesaid. A police officer before arrest, in such cases has to be further satisfied that such arrest is necessary to prevent such person from committing any further offence; or for proper investigation of the case; or to prevent the accused from causing the evidence of the offence to disappear; or tampering with such evidence in any manner; or to prevent such person from making any inducement, threat or promise to a witness so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or the police officer; or unless such accused person is arrested, his presence in the court whenever required cannot be ensured. These are the conclusions, which one may reach based on facts.

7.2. The law mandates the police officer to state the facts and record the reasons in writing which led him to come to a conclusion covered by any of the provisions aforesaid, while making such arrest. The law further requires the police officers to record the reasons in writing for not making the arrest.

7.3. In pith and core, the police officer before arrest must put a question to himself, why arrest? Is it really required ? What purpose it will serve ? What object it will achieve ? It is only after these questions are addressed and one or the other conditions as enumerated above is satisfied, the power of arrest needs to be exercised. Before arrest first the police officers should have reason to believe on the basis of information and material that the accused has committed the offence. Apart from this, the police officer has to be satisfied further that the arrest is necessary for one or the more purposes envisaged by sub-clauses (a) to (e) of clause (1) of Section 41 Cr.P.C.

9. Another provision i.e. Section 41-A Cr.P.C. aimed to avoid unnecessary arrest or threat of arrest looming large on the accused requires to be vitalized. This provision makes it clear that in allcases where the arrest of a person is not required under Section 41(1) Cr.P.C., the police officer is required to issue notice directing the accused to appear before him at a specified place and time. Law

obliges such an accused to appear before the police officer and it further mandates that if such an accused complies with the terms of notice he shall not be arrested, unless for reasons to be recorded, the police officer is of the opinion that the arrest is necessary. At this stage also, the condition precedent for arrest as envisaged under Section 41 Cr.P.C. has to be complied and shall be subject to the same scrutiny by the Magistrate as aforesaid.

In view of above and considering the principles laid down by the Apex Court in the case of Arnesh Kumar (Supra), this Court is inclined to direct thus:

(i) That, the police may resort to the extreme step of arrest only when the same is necessary and the petitioner fails to cooperate in the investigation.

(ii) That, the petitioner should first be summoned to cooperate in the investigation. If the petitioner cooperates in the investigation then the occasion of his arrest should not arise.

The aforesaid order in regard to the petitioner shall remain in force subject to his planting 25 saplings of indigenous fruit bearing or shady trees on the side of the road/street of the place of residence of petitioner or at any other place in the district which is earmarked by the Collector/Revenue Authority for planting trees and shall take care of the trees for the next one year by watering the plants and by installing tree guards at his own expenses. In case the petitioner is unable to afford incurring of such expenses, then he would obtain saplings/tree guard from the forest authorities (the concerned Forest Range Officer of the area) free of cost or at concessional/nominal rates available under any beneficial scheme of the Government. The petitioner shall file affidavit disclosing compliance of this condition within 30 days in the Registry, failing which this Court may consider cancellation of bail.

The DFO of the concerned district is directed to file verification report before the trial court concerned after carrying out inspection personally or through any other officer of the Forest Department duly authorized in that behalf, disclosing as to whether petitioner has complied with condition No.8 or not, and if yes to what extent?

The learned trial Judge on receiving report of non compliance of the said condition shall forthwith communicate the same to Registry of this Court.

The Registry on receiving any such report from the trial Court disclosing default shall put up the matter before appropriate bench in shape of PUD.

A copy of this order be sent to the Court concerned for compliance.

A copy of this order be furnished by the Registry of this court to the concerned District Magistrate and the DFO having territorial jurisdiction over the place of residence of the petitioner for execution of the order in the interest of the ecology.

Let a typed copy of this order be also supplied to the counsel for the State for

compliance of the aforesaid directives.

With the aforesaid directions, the present first anticipatory bail application, for the time being, stands disposed of.

C.c. as per rules.