Court No. - 73

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 438 CR.P.C. No. - 10224 of 2023

Applicant :- Jalal
Opposite Party :- State of U.P.
Counsel for Applicant :- Zainul Abdin
Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Nalin Kumar Srivastava,J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.

2. This application has been moved on behalf of the applicant - **Jalal** seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime No. 458 of 2021, under Sections 3/5/8 of U.P. Cow Slaughter (Prevention) Act, Police Station- Mauaima, District- Prayagraj.

3. Remains of cow progeny were recovered on 9.8.2021. FIR was lodged and investigation started and during investigation co-accused Mohd. Danish was held by the police and on the basis of his confessional statement the name of the present applicant came into light.

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant that applicant is innocent and he has apprehension of arrest in the above-mentioned case, whereas there is no credible evidence against him. Allegations levelled against the applicant are false. Investigation is going on in the matter. It is further submitted that the applicant is not named in the FIR and his name came into light on the basis of the confessional statement of co-accused Mohd. Danish. It is further submitted that no incriminating article has been recovered from his possession or from a place under control of the present applicant. The criminal history of one solitary case has been well explained in the affidavit. The applicant is cooperating with the investigation of the case. In case applicant is granted anticipatory bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and would obey all conditions of bail.

5. Learned A.G.A. opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail but however could not dispute this factual aspect of the matter that the applicant is not named in the FIR and no incriminating article has

been recovered from his possession or from a place under his control.

6. In **Sushila Aggarwal and others vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another, (2020) 5 SCC 1**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that while considering an application for grant of anticipatory bail, the court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation, or tampering with evidence including intimidating witnesses, llikelihood of fleeing justice, such as leaving the country, etc. It has further been held that Courts ought to be generally guided by considerations such as the nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, and the facts of the case, while considering whether to grant anticipatory bail, or refuse it. Whether to grant or not is a matter of discretion.

7. In **Siddharth Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Another, (2022) 1 Supreme Court Cases 676**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that personal liberty is an important aspect of our constitutional mandate. The occasion to arrest an accused during investigation arises when custodial investigation becomes necessary or it is a heinous crime or where there is a possibility of influencing the witnesses or accused may abscond. Merely because an arrest can be made because it is lawful does not mandate that arrest must be made. A distinction must be made between the existence of the power to arrest and the justification for exercise of it. If arrest is made routine, it can cause incalculable harm to the reputation and self-esteem of a person. If the Investigating Officer has no reason to believe that the accused will abscond or disobey summons and has, in fact, throughout cooperated with the investigation, then there is no compulsion on the officer to arrest the accused.

8. Considering the settled principles of law regarding anticipatory bail, submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, nature of accusation, role of applicant and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion of the merits of the case, in my view, it is a fit case for anticipatory bail to the applicant till filing of police report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C. before the competent Court.

9. The application is **allowed** accordingly.

10. In the event of arrest of the applicant, he shall be released on anticipatory bail on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of Station House Officer of the police station concerned with the

following conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.

(ii) The applicant 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police office.

(iii) The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court and if he has passport, the same shall be deposited by him before the S.S.P./S.P. Concerned.

11. In case of default of any of the conditions, the Investigating Officer shall be at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of interim protection granted to the applicant.

Order Date :- 13.10.2023
Fhd

Digitally signed by :-
FAHAD NIYAZ
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad