

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAMAKRISHNAN

TUESDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/1ST POUSHA, 1937

Bail Appl..No. 7488 of 2015 ()

**-----
CRIME NO. 71/2015 OF AMARAVILA EXCISE RANGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT
-----**

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

**-----
PRAMOD, AGED 35 YEARS, S/O.ASOKAN,
KADAVANKODU COLONY, PERUMPAZHUTHOOR VILLAGE,
NEYYATTINKARA TALUK, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.R.T.PRADEEP

RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT:

**-----
THE STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.**

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT. R.REMA

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 22-12-2015, ALONG WITH BA.NO. 7489 OF 2015, THE COURT
ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

sts

K. RAMAKRISHNAN, J.

B.A.Nos.7488 & 7489 of 2015

Dated this the 22nd day of December, 2015

ORDER

The above applications were filed by the accused in Crime No.71/2015 and 67/2015 of Amaravila Excise Range for regular bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

2. The common case in both these cases was that the accused was found to be in possession of huge quantity of wash on 04.11.2015 and 21.10.2015 and he was arrested on 03.11.2015 in Crime No.71/2015 and during enquiry it was revealed that he was involved in the other case also So his arrest was recorded in Crime No.67/2015 on 30.11.2015.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is a false case foisted against him and it was on the basis of a complaint given by the owner of the property from where the article was said to have been seized, that he has been falsely implicated in the above cases. So according to him, he was not the person who stored these articles in the property from where it was alleged to have been seized.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application on the ground that investigation is in progress and the petitioner is also involved in ten other such cases.

5. Going through the reports of the Investigating Officer, it appears that the petitioner is accused in several cases of this nature. Though he was arrested in connection with Crime No.71/2015 of Amaravila Excise Range on 03.11.2015 and his arrest was recorded on 30.11.2015 in Crime No.67/2015 of the same Excise Range, considering the implication of Section 41A of the Abkari Act, it cannot be said that he will not involve in any other crime of similar nature in future if bail is granted.

So considering the circumstances, this Court feels that it is not a fit case to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage in the above crimes and the petitions are liable to be dismissed.

In the result, these bail applications are dismissed.

SD/-
K. RAMAKRISHNAN
JUDGE