

Court No. - 12

Case :- APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 10336 of 2023

Applicant :- Shiv Bhagwan Tiwari And Another

Opposite Party :- State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Deptt. Of Home Lko. And Another

Counsel for Applicant :- Anil Sharma, Sameer Shukla, Vinay Kumar Singh

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Rajeev Singh, J.

1. Vakalatnama filed by Shri Manoj Kumar Mishra, Advocate on behalf of private respondent is taken on record.
2. Heard Shri Anil Sharma, learned counsel for the applicants, Shri Manoj Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for private respondent as well as learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
3. The present application has been filed with a prayer to quash charge-sheet dated 10.04.2011 arising out of Case Crime No.89 of 2011, under Sections 324, 504, 506, 308 I.P.C., Police Station Colonelganj District Gonda as well as summoning order dated 04.10.2023 passed by Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-I, Gonda.
4. Learned counsel for private respondent submitted that before the present application, applicants had filed three applications i.e. Application U/S 482 No.3192 of 2011, Application U/S 482 No.3742 of 2012 and Criminal Misc. Anticipatory Bail Application U/S 438 Cr.P.C. No.14410 of 2021 and these application have already been rejected by the Co-ordinate Benches of this Court.
5. After arguing the matter at some length, learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants are ready to appear before the trial court and also requested that their application may be disposed of in terms of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Satendra Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another (Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.5191 of 2021.***
6. Learned A.G.A. has no objection in grant of aforesaid prayer.
7. Considering the arguments of learned counsels for the parties and going through the record, it cannot be said that no offence

is made out against applicants and all the submissions made at the bar relate to the disputed questions of fact, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this Court in proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

8. At this stage only prima-facie case is to be seen in the light of the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **"R.P. Kapur Vs. State of Punjab, A.I.R. 1960 S.C. 866, State of Haryana Vs. Bhajan Lal, 1992 SCC (Cr.) 426, State of Bihar Vs. P.P.Sharma, 1992 SCC (Cr.) 192** and lastly **Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. Vs. Mohd. Saraful Haq, another (Para-10) 2005 SCC (Cr.) 283** and **Parabathbai Ahir & Ors. Vs. State of Gujarat AIR 2017 SC 4843"**.

9. A seven judges Bench of this Court in the case of **"Amrawati and another Vs. State of U.P. reported in 2004 (57) ALR 290** and **Hon'ble Apex Court in Lal Kamendra Pratap Singh Vs. State of U.P. reported in 2009 (3) ADJ 322 (SC)** and in **Hussain and Ors. Vs. Union of India (UOI) and Ors.** reported in **MANU/SC/0274/2017** have given various directions to criminal Courts for expeditious disposal of Bail applications. The ratio of above mentioned decisions is quite clear that, in the backdrop of Article 21 of the Constitution of India as the personal liberty of a person is at stake, the bail application should be decided, expeditiously.

10. In the recent judgment, the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in SUO MOTO WRIT (CRL) No. (S) 1 of 2017 In RE: To issue certain guidelines regarding inadequacies and deficiencies in criminal trials vs. The State of Andhra Pradesh & Ors.** vide its judgment and order dated 20.04.2021 has observed the common deficiencies which occurred in the proceedings of the criminal cases and approved "The Draft Rules of Criminal Practice 2021" which is the part of the judgment in **Chapter V Rule 17** of aforesaid Rules that the application for bail in non-bailable cases must ordinarily be disposed off within a period of 3 to 7 days from the date of first hearing. If the application is not disposed off within such period, the Presiding Officer shall furnish reasons thereof in the order itself.

11. Further, as the Apex Court in **Satendra Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another (Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.5191 of 2021** has already laid down guidelines for grant of bail, without fettering the discretion of the courts concerned and the statutory provisions governing consideration in grant of bail, no specific directions need be issued by this Court as it is expected that the court concerned will take into consideration the necessary guidelines already issued by the Apex Court.

12. In backdrop of aforesaid decisions and keeping in view the entirety of facts and circumstances of the case and having regard to the submissions of learned counsel for the applicants, the application is **disposed of** with a direction to the court concerned that if the applicants apply for bail before the court concerned within 30 days from today, their prayer for bail shall be considered and decided expeditiously in accordance with law.

13. For a period of 30 days from today or till the applicants apply for bail, whichever is earlier, no coercive action shall be taken against the applicants in the aforesaid case.

14. Trial court is directed to conclude trial, expeditiously without giving unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties as the alleged offence is of the year 2011.

15. District and Sessions Judge, Gonda is also directed to monitor the trial of the case in question.

Order Date :- 19.10.2023

V. Sinha