

Court No. - 73

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC ANTICIPATORY BAIL
APPLICATION U/S 438 CR.P.C. No. - 13002 of 2023

Applicant :- Raju Saxena @ Rajendra Saxena

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

Counsel for Applicant :- Vivek Tripathi, Sampoorina Nand

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 - **Raju Saxena @ Rajendra Saxena** seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime No. 618 of 2023, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, Section 60 (2) / 72 of U.P. Production of Excise Duty & Act and Sections 54 and 64 of Copy Right Amended Act, 1957, Police Station Bhojipura, District Bareilly.
3. A huge quantity of spurious liquor and illegal spirit was held from the co-accused persons namely, Ranjeet Singh and Neeraj Gupta and on the basis of their statement, two other co-accused persons namely, Islamuddin and Girish were also held by the police and the name of the present applicant came into light on the basis of the statement of co-accused persons, who stated that the applicant is the persons, who sells the illegal spirit. F.I.R. was lodged on 28.9.2023 and investigation started, which is going on.
4. It has been argued 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 also submitted that the applicant is not named in the F.I.R. His name came into light on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused persons made in the police custody. It is also submitted that no incriminating article has been recovered from the possession or the place under control of the present applicant. Applicant has absolutely no concern with the alleged incident. It is also submitted that the criminal history of the applicant has been explained by way of supplementary affidavit. He has been cooperative with the investigation so far and

as such he is entitled for anticipatory bail. In case the applicant is granted anticipatory bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail and would obey all conditions of bail.

5. Per contra, learned A.G.A. opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail, but however could not dispute the factual aspect that the name of the applicant came into light in this matter on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused persons and nothing incriminating has been recovered from his possession or 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, likelihood 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 till filing of police report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C. before the competent Court 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 protection granted to the applicant.

Order Date :- 11.12.2023

SS