

(2024) 02 GUJ CK 0081

In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : R/Criminal Misc.Application (For Regular Bail - After Chargesheet) No.
3028 Of 2024

Vikash Virendra Sing

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 27-02-2024

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 439
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 120(b), 143, 144, 147, 148, 149, 302, 323
Gujarat Police Act, 1951 — Section 135

Citation : (2024) 02 GUJ CK 0081

Hon'ble Judges : Divyesh A. Joshi, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Arjunsingh B Chauhan, Chintan Dave

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Divyesh A. Joshi, J

1. Rule. Learned APP waives service of notice of Rule on behalf of respondent-State.
2. The present application is filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for regular bail in connection with C.R. No. 11210045202984 of 2020 registered with the Pandesara Police Station, District Surat for the offence punishable under Sections 143, 144, 147, 148, 149, 302, 323, 120(b) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 135 of the Gujarat Police Act.
3. Learned advocate Mr. Chauhan appearing on behalf of the applicant has submitted that the so called incident has occurred on 26.10.2020 and on the same day FIR was registered and in connection with the same, the applicant was arrested on 04.11.2023 and since then, he is in judicial custody. It is also submitted that the investigation is already completed and the present application is filed after submission of the charge-sheet. Learned advocate submitted that

FIR is registered against two accused persons, wherein the applicant is not named in the FIR, however during the course of investigation, name of the applicant and other accused persons was disclosed and, thereafter, the applicant has been arrested and chargesheeted by the IO. Learned advocate submitted that so far as the role attributed to the present applicant is concerned, it is alleged that the present applicant was standing outside of the society, where the so-called incident had occurred, with a sole intent to stop other persons and he has not inflicted any blow on the body of the deceased and except this, there is no other role attributed to him. Learned advocate further submits that identically situated persons, who were standing along with present applicant at the time of commission of crime, have already been considered by the concerned trial Court. Learned advocate submitted that considering the role attributed to the present applicant as well as principle of law of parity, the present applicant may be enlarged on regular bail by imposing suitable terms and conditions.

4. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the respondent-State has opposed the present bail application. It is submitted that the role of the present applicant is clearly spelt out from the body of the compilation of the charge sheet papers. He further submitted that considering the role attributed by the present applicant, the present application may not be considered.

5. Learned advocates appearing on behalf of the respective parties do not press for further reasoned order.

6. I have perused the police papers as well as documents produced by the applicant along with the memo of the application. It is found out from the record that the applicant is jail since 04.11.2023. The investigation is already completed and the present application is filed after submission of the charge-sheet. I have considered the role attributed to the present applicant – accused and found that the applicant has not inflicted any blow on the body of the deceased but he was standing outside to stop other persons. Further, the identically situated persons have already been considered by the concerned trial Court. Considering the above stated factual aspect and considering the role attributed by the present applicant at the time of commission offence and on the ground of principle of law of parity, I am inclined to exercise the discretion in favour of the applicant.

7. This Court has also taken into consideration the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Sanjay Chandra v. Central Bureau of Investigation, reported in [2012]1 SCC 40 as well as in case of Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation & Anr. reported in (2022)10 SCC 51.

8. In the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the nature of the allegations made against the applicant in the FIR, without discussing the evidence in detail, prima facie, this Court is of the opinion that this is a fit case to exercise the discretion and enlarge the applicant on regular bail.

9. Hence, the present application is allowed and the applicant is ordered to be released on regular bail in connection with C.R. No. 11210045202984 of 2020

registered with the Pandesara Police Station, District Surat, on executing a personal bond of Rs. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court and subject to the conditions that he shall;

[a] not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse liberty;

[b] not act in a manner injurious to the interest of the prosecution;

[c] surrender passport, if any, to the lower court within a week;

[d] not leave the State of Gujarat without prior permission of the Sessions Judge concerned;

[e] mark presence before the concerned Police Station on alternate Monday of every English calendar month for a period of six months between 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.;

[f] furnish the present address of residence to the Investigating Officer and also to the Court at the time of execution of the bond and shall not change the residence without prior permission of this Court;

10. The authorities will release the applicant only if he is not required in connection with any other offence for the time being. If breach of any of the above conditions is committed, the Sessions Judge concerned will be free to issue warrant or take appropriate action in the matter. Bail bond to be executed before the lower Court having jurisdiction to try the case. It will be open for the concerned Court to delete, modify and/or relax any of the above conditions, in accordance with law.

11. At the trial, the trial Court shall not be influenced by the observations of preliminary nature qua the evidence at this stage made by this Court while enlarging the applicant on bail.

12. The present application stands allowed accordingly. Rule made absolute to the aforesaid extent.

Direct service is permitted.