

Court No. - 73

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC ANTICIPATORY BAIL
APPLICATION U/S 438 CR.P.C. No. - 12297 of 2023

Applicant :- Uma Shankar

Opposite Party :- State of U.P. and Another

Counsel for Applicant :- Ajay Sengar

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Nalin Kumar Srivastava,J.

1. Present Anticipatory Bail Application has been filed with the prayer to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant - **Uma Shankar** in Criminal Case No. 2719 of 2012, arising out of Case Crime No. 0160 of 1995, under Section 304 IPC, Police Station - Churkhi, District - Jalaun at Orai.

2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material available on record.

3. The custodial death of accused Ravi Shanker @ Pappu, who was an accused in case crime no. 82/1995 under Section 20 N.D.P.S. Act, was caused in the District Jail Hospital and it was found during enquiry that while he was in police custody, he was tortured bitterly by the police personnel including the present applicant having many injuries over his body. After investigation, final report was submitted in the case but the Court concerned straightway summoned the applicant alongwith other co-accused persons to face trial for the offence under Section 304 IPC vide order dated 2.11.2012.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is innocent and has no concern with the present matter. Allegations levelled against the applicant are false. It is further submitted that the applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the applicant has apprehension of his arrest by the police any time. It is also submitted that the applicant has no concern with the present matter. It is also submitted that no evidence has been found by the Investigating Officer during investigation, therefore, final report was submitted into the matter. It is also submitted that the applicant alongwith other co-accused persons had approached this Court by way of Application U/S 482 CrPC No. 1545 of 2014 wherein vide order

dated 17.1.2014 interim protection was granted to him but on 7.4.2014 the said application was dismissed for want of prosecution.

5. Per contra, the learned A.G.A. opposed the prayer and submitted that sufficient evidence has been collected against the accused applicant, which shows the involvement of the applicant in the present matter. Offence alleged against the accused applicant is of serious nature. It is further submitted by the learned A.G.A. that in the present case process under section 82 Cr.P.C. has also been issued against the applicant by the Court concerned, which means that he has been declared a proclaimed offender by the Court and as such he is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

6. I have considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the entire record carefully.

7. From the perusal of the record it reflects that the anticipatory bail application moved by the applicant before the Sessions Court concerned was rejected after hearing on 22.9.2023. Process under section 82 Cr.P.C. had already been issued against the applicant. Learned A.G.A. has submitted that as per the case diary, process under section 82 Cr.P.C. was issued against the applicant on 24.7.2023, which means that when the application for anticipatory bail was moved by the applicant before the Sessions Court, he was already a proclaimed offender. The present anticipatory bail application has been moved on 2.11.2023 before this Court.

8. The conduct of the applicant falls within the ambit of the law promulgated by Hon'ble Apex Court in **Prem Shankar Prasad Versus State of Bihar and Another, 2021 SCC OnLine Supreme Court 955**. In the facts of the case, charge-sheet was filed under Sections 406, 420 IPC against the accused and thus it was explicit that a prima facie case against the accused was found. From the record, it reveals that the arrest warrant was issued by the Magistrate against the accused and thereafter proceedings under Sections 82, 83 Cr.P.C. had been initiated pursuant to the order passed by the Magistrate. Only thereafter the accused moved an application before the trial court for anticipatory bail, which was rejected by the Sessions Court. However, subsequently anticipatory bail was granted to the aforesaid accused by the High Court and when the matter came before the Hon'ble Apex Court, it was observed like this-

"19. Despite the above observations on merits and despite the fact

that it was brought to the notice of the High Court that respondent No. 2 - accused is absconding and even the proceedings under sections 82-83 of Cr. P.C. have been initiated as far as back on 10.01.2019, the High Court has just ignored the aforesaid relevant aspects and has granted anticipatory bail to respondent No. 2 - accused by observing that the nature of accusation is arising out of a business transaction. The specific allegations of cheating, etc., which came to be considered by learned Additional Sessions Judge has not at all been considered by the High Court. Even the High Court has just ignored the factum of initiation of proceedings under sections 82-83 of Cr. P.C. by simply observing that "be that as it may". The aforesaid relevant aspect on grant of anticipatory bail ought not to have been ignored by the High Court and ought to have been considered by the High Court very seriously and not casually.

20. In the case of State of Madhya Pradesh v. Pradeep Sharma (Supra), it is observed and held by this court that if anyone is declared as an absconder/proclaimed offender in terms of section 82 of Cr. P.C., he is not entitled to relief of anticipatory bail."

9. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Lavesh Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) (2012) 8 SCC 730**, relied upon by the learned counsel for the applicant, has held that "Normally, when the accused is "absconding" and declared as a "proclaimed offender", there is no question of granting anticipatory bail. We reiterate that when a person against whom a warrant had been issued and is absconding or concealing himself in order to avoid execution of warrant and declared as a proclaimed offender in terms of Section 82 of the Code he is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail."

10. Further, the judgment passed in **Lavesh** (supra) was referred by the Hon'ble Apex Court in State of **Madhya Pradesh vs. Pradeep Sharma, (2014) 2 Supreme Court Cases 171** and referring to paragraph 12 of the judgment of Lavesh (supra), in paragraph 16 of the said judgment, it was observed, relevant portion of which is as under :

"16.....It is clear from the above decision that if anyone is declared as an absconder / proclaimed offender in terms of Section 82 of the Code, he is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail."

11. Hence, from the aforesaid case laws it is evident that as per normal rule, anticipatory bail cannot be granted to an accused who is absconding or concealing himself in order to avoid execution of the process of the Court and has been declared as proclaimed

offender. Further, in view of the recent pronouncement of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **State of Haryana vs. Dharamraj, 2023 SCC Online SC 1085**, decided on 29.8.2023, wherein the legal position regarding maintainability of an application for grant of anticipatory bail to a proclaimed offender has been elucidated, the present application is not maintainable.

12. In view of that, I deem it not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the present applicant. Such a person, who does not cooperate with the investigation / trial court at all, is not entitled to get any relief from this Court by way of anticipatory bail.

13. The anticipatory bail application is, accordingly, **rejected**.

Order Date :- 21.11.2023

safi