

Court No. - 85

Case :- CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 8554 of 2023

Appellant :- Yatendra

Respondent :- State of U.P. and Another

Counsel for Appellant :- Satish Mishra

Counsel for Respondent :- G.A.

Hon'ble Mayank Kumar Jain,J.

As per office report, notice upon the opposite party no.2/informant has been served personally but no one appears on his behalf.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned Additional Government Advocate for the State of U.P. and perused the record. This criminal appeal under Section 14-A(2) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act has been preferred by the appellant with the prayer to set aside the bail rejection order dated 03.03.2023 passed by learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Firozabad in Bail Application No. 552 of 2023, arising out of Case Crime No. 168 of 2020, under Sections 323, 504, 506, 34, 354-Kha IPC & Section 3 (1) Da, Dha and 3 (2) (5a) of SC/ST Act, Police Station Eka, District Firozabad.

Learned counsel for the appellant argued that the appellant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. As per the first information report, the dispute took place regarding installation of Idol of Hanumanji facing towards the garbage dump. It is further submitted that there are general allegations against all the accused persons. No specific role has been assigned to the appellant. It is further submitted that similarly placed co-accused Monti @ Karunakar has already been granted bail by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 08.05.2023 passed in Criminal Appeal No. 3029 of 2023. The appellant has one case criminal history i.e. case crime No. 361 of 2022 in which he has already been granted bail. Lastly, it is submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that there is no chance of the appellant fleeing away from the judicial process or tampering with the prosecution evidence. The appellant is languishing in jail since 29.11.2022 and in case he is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and will cooperate in the early disposal of the case.

Per contra, learned A.G.A. opposed the prayer for bail but could not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects of the matter.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the nature of the offence, evidence, complicity of the accused, severity of punishment, this Court is of the view that the appellant has made out a case for bail. The Court below erred in rejecting the bail application. The impugned order suffers from infirmity and illegality and the same is liable to be set-aside and the appeal is liable to be allowed.

Accordingly, the appeal is **allowed** and the impugned order rejecting the bail application of the appellant is set-aside.

Let the appellant, namely, **Yatendra** involved in the above Case be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to following conditions. Further, before issuing the release order, the sureties be verified.

- (i) The appellant will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The appellant will not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness.
- (iii) The appellant will appear before the trial court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.
- (iv) The appellant shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected.
- (v) The appellant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move bail cancellation application before this Court.

Order Date :- 17.10.2023

AKT