

Court No. - 85

Case :- CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 9254 of 2023

Appellant :- Allarakkhoo

Respondent :- State of U.P. and Another

Counsel for Appellant :- Keshari Nandan Singh

Counsel for Respondent :- G.A.

Hon'ble Mayank Kumar Jain,J.

Third Supplementary affidavit filed today by the learned counsel for the appellant is taken on record.

Compliance affidavit filed today by learned A.G.A is taken on record.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned AGA for opposite party no.1 and learned counsel for the informant and perused the material placed on record.

The present criminal appeal under Section 14-A(2) Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act has been filed by the appellant to set aside the impugned order dated 09.06.2023 whereby the Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Jalaun (Orai) in bail application no. 89 of 2023 of the appellant moved by him in S.T. No. 36 of 2018, arising out of Case Crime No.147 of 2018, under Sections 302, 307, 34 of IPC, and Section 3(2)V of SC/ST Act, Police Station Ata, District Jalaun.

Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that appellant is not named in the F.I.R, name of the appellant is disclosed by the informant that he had suspicion that appellant and his son committed murder of his wife Jai Devi and also fired upon Bala Prasad, Jishan, Azad and Bhure @ Mahendra Pal It is further submitted that informant Ramphal Srivas was examined as prosecution witness has not corroborated the version of the prosecution and categorically denied the involvement of the appellant in the crime and turned hostile, thereafter, eye witness Ahsaan was examined as prosecution witness who also turned hostile and denied that he had seen any such incident. It is also submitted that injured Jishan and Bala Prasad have also been examined as prosecution witness and they did not even identified the appellant during their statements and have not corroborated the version of the prosecution and have turned hostile. It is further submitted that

so far as recovery of country made pistol is concerned it is shown in Case Crime No. 146 of 2018 while the present case is in case crime no. 147 of 2018. It is a case of malicious prosecution under the provisions of S.C./S.T. Act. Appellant is languishing in jail since 03.08.2018 and criminal history of the appellant has been explained the supplementary affidavit. In case, the appellant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

Per contra, learned A.G.A. has supported the order passed by the Sessions court and vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the appellant and submitted that appellant has a huge criminal history to his credit but could not dispute the fact that statements given by the prosecution witnesses does not corroborate the prosecution version.

In **Union of India Vs. K.A. Najeeb (2021) 3 SCC 713**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that:-

"15. This Court has clarified in numerous judgments that the liberty guaranteed by Part III of the Constitution would cover within its protective ambit not only due procedure and fairness but also access to justice and a speedy trial. In Supreme Court Legal Aid Committee v. Union of India SCC para-15 it was held that undertrials c15. This Court has clarified in numerous judgments that the liberty guaranteed by Part III of the Constitution would cover within its protective ambit not only due procedure and fairness but also access to justice and a speedy trial. In Supreme Court Legal Aid Committee v. Union of India SCC para-15 it was held that undertrials cannot indefinitely be detained pending trial. Ideally, no person ought to suffer adverse consequences of his acts unless the same is established before a neutral arbiter. However, owing to the practicalities of real life where to secure an effective trial and to ameliorate the risk to society in case a potential criminal is left at large pending trial, the Courts are tasked with deciding whether an individual ought to be released pending trial or not. Once it is obvious that a timely trial would not be possible and the accused has suffered incarceration for a significant period of time, Courts would ordinarily be obligated to enlarge them on bail." annot indefinitely be detained pending trial. Ideally, no person ought to suffer adverse consequences of his acts unless the same is established before a neutral arbiter. However, owing to the practicalities of real life where to secure an effective trial and to ameliorate the risk to society in case a potential criminal is left at large pending trial, the Courts are tasked with deciding whether an individual ought to be released pending trial or not. Once it is obvious that a timely trial would not be possible and the accused has suffered incarceration for a

significant period of time, Courts would ordinarily be obligated to enlarge them on bail."

It appears from the arguments advanced by the counsel for the parties and from perusal of material on record that the trial court has not properly considered the case of the appellant. Hence, in view of above consideration, the impugned order of rejection of bail passed by the trial court is, hereby, set aside.

Having considered the submissions of the parties noted above, finding force in the submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellant; appellant being under-trial having fundamental right to speedy; larger mandate of the Article 21 of the Constitution of India, considering 5-6 times overcrowding in jails over and above their capacity by under trials and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, Court is of the opinion that the appellant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

Let appellant, **Allarakkhoo** be released on bail in the aforesaid case crime number on his furnishing a personal bond and two heavy local sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to the following conditions:

(i) 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.

(ii) The appellant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witnesses.

(iii) The appellant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 313 of Cr.P.C.

(iv) The appellant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in the trial court.

(v) The appellant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel.

(vi) The appellant shall not indulge in any criminal activity or commission of any crime after being released on bail.

In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a

ground for cancellation of bail. If in the opinion of the trial court that absence of the appellant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed in accordance with law.

The trial court may make all possible efforts/endeavour and try to conclude the trial expeditiously in accordance with law after the release of the appellant, if there is no other legal impediment.

It is made clear that the observations made in this order are limited to the purpose of determination of this bail application and will in no way be construed as an expression on the merits of the case. The trial court shall be absolutely free to arrive at its independent conclusions on the basis of evidence led unaffected by anything said in this order.

The criminal appeal is allowed.

Order Date :- 9.11.2023

PS