

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRMP No. 1536 of 2017**

Gaurav Joshi, S/o. Vijay Devidas Joshi, Aged About 29 Years, R/o. Chagorabhata, Raipur, Near Sahu Ata Chakki, P. S. D.D. Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh, Through P.S. Balod, District Balod, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondent**

For Petitioner : Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate

For Respondent-State : Mr. Adhiraj Surana, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****12.02.2018**

1. The instant petition is against the order dated 09.10.2017, passed by the Sessions Judge Balod in Criminal Revision No.28/2017 whereby the revision has been dismissed. The revision was *inter alia* against the order dated 22.09.2017 passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate Balod in Criminal Case No.221/2016 wherein the application under Section 437(6) of Cr.P.C. to enlarge the petitioner on bail was dismissed.
2. The facts of the case, in brief, is that a charge sheet was filed against the petitioner under Section 420, 467, 468 & 471 of I.P.C. in Crime No.363/2015 and he was arrested on 18.11.2015. Subsequently, when the charge sheet was filed, the charges were framed on 08.04.2016 and the first date of evidence was fixed for 22.04.2016. Thereafter, the trial could not be completed within a period of 60 days from the date of taking the first evidence. Thereafter, the application was filed for bail which stands rejected initially by the Chief Judicial Magistrate and subsequently when it was

assailed before the revisional Court, the revisional Court too affirmed the order of rejection of bail. Hence, this petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that after the order dated 22.04.2016 as many as 21 dates were passed up till 21.09.2017 and thereafter till date the evidence is not completed. Therefore, there is violation of statutory provisions of Section 437(6) of Cr.P.C. and therefore the petitioner cannot be kept for time immemorial and he may be enlarged on bail.
4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the argument and would submit that there is no deliberate omission on the part of the State/ prosecution to produce the witnesses and at certain instance the witnesses though were produced, adjournment was sought for at the behest of the petitioner. Consequently, he cannot claim for bail for his own fault and, as such, the petition has no merit and the order is well merited, which do not call for any interference.
5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties, perused the pleadings and documents appended thereto.
6. This fact is not in dispute that the petitioner is in jail since 18.11.2015 and the order sheets which are placed would suggest that thereafter when the case was fixed for evidence on 22.04.2016 till 21.09.2017 approximately 32 dates have been passed.
7. In the case of ***Riza Abdul Razak Zunzunia vs. State of Gujarat***¹, the scope, extent and object of provisions contained in Section 437(6) of Cr.P.C. has been considered and observed as under :-

¹ 2009 Cr.L.J. 4766

21. The question that arises for determination is as to what would be the considerations which would weigh with the Magistrate while deciding an application under Section 437(6) of the Code. Whether the reasons for not releasing an accused on bail would be similar to the reasons for not granting regular bail or whether some special circumstances should exist for the purpose of declining grant of bail under Section 437(6) of the Code? On behalf of the Bank it has been contended that factors like existence of a prima facie case, gravity of the offence and the likelihood of conviction which give rise to a belief that the accused is not likely to remain present at the time of the trial are required to be taken into consideration, whereas on behalf of the applicant it has been contended that such factors are not germane while deciding an application under Section 437(6) of the Code. On a plain reading of the provision as well as considering the object behind enacting the said provision if the contention advanced on behalf of the Bank viz. the prima facie case, gravity of offence, involvement of the accused, etc. are the factors which are to be taken into consideration while deciding the application under Section 437(6) of the Code, were to be accepted, the same would render the said provision nugatory, inasmuch as if the same reasons for which the application for regular bail is refused, are to be considered while deciding the application under Section 437(6) of the Code, there would be no necessity for making such a provision. The application under Section 437(6) of the Code would stand rejected merely on the ground that the application for regular bail had been rejected. In the opinion of this Court, the factors which should be kept in mind while considering an application under Section 437(6) would be different from the factors that are to be taken into consideration while deciding an application for regular bail. Though it may not be possible to lay down any exhaustive list of such factors which may be taken into consideration while deciding the application under Section 437(6) of the Code, some relevant factors would be whether the trial has been delayed on account of the default on the part of the applicant; whether the accused has at any stage during the course of investigation or as an under trial prisoner been absconding; if having regard to the facts of the case there is every likelihood of his jumping bail; or if there are special circumstances due to which it may be deemed expedient not to exercise powers under Section 437(6) etc. But bail cannot be refused for reasons which are generally invoked for refusing bail. The following observations made by the Apex Court in *Aslam Babalal Desai v. State of Maharashtra*, (1992) 4 SCC 272: (1992 Cr.L.J.3712) in the context of compulsive bail under the proviso to Section 167(2) are apt even in the context of Section 437(6) of the Code: "15. Even where two views are possible, this being a matter belonging to the field of criminal justice involving the liberty of an individual, the provision must be construed strictly in favour of individual liberty since even the law expects early completion of the investigation. The delay in completion of the investigation can be on pain of the accused being released on bail. The

prosecution cannot be allowed to trifle with individual liberty if it does not take its task seriously or does not complete it within the time allowed by law.

22. Drawing an analogy, it can be safely stated that law expects early conclusion of cases triable by Magistrate. The delay in completion of trial in such cases, must therefore, be at the pain of the accused being released on bail, except where the Magistrate by reasons recorded in writing otherwise direct. The said provision therefore, has to be construed strictly in favour of individual liberty. Importing the grounds relevant for the purpose of granting regular bail, for the purpose of deciding an application for bail under Section 437(6) of the Code would not only amount to doing violence to the statute but would defeat the very object of introducing such a provision and reduced it to a mere dead letter. The prosecution, therefore, cannot be permitted to trifle with individual liberty if it does not diligently pursue the proceedings before the Magistrate to ensure that the trial is concluded within the period prescribed under Section 437(6) of the Code.”

8. In a series of decisions including decision of this Court in the case of ***Lal Sahu Vs. State of Chhattisgarh***², ***Haricharan Ramteke v. State of Chhattisgarh***³, ***Smt. Godawari Bai and Others vs. State of Chhattisgarh***⁴ and decision of other High Courts cited before this Court, the scope and ambit of provision contained under Section 437(6) of Cr.P.C. has been considered. Broadly speaking while considering application for grant of bail under Section 437(6) of Cr.P.C., the considerations are those which have been laid down by this Court in the case of ***Lal Sahu (supra)*** in para 11 which is reproduced herein below :

“11. The question that arises for determination is as to what factors should weigh with the Magistrate while refusing grant of bail under sub-section (6) of Section 437 of the Code. In my considered opinion, apart from the gravity of offence and the quantum of punishment, one or more of the following factors, among others may weigh with the Magistrate while refusing bail:-

(a) the overall impact of the offence and the release of the person accused of such offence on the society,

2 2012 (1) MPHT 67

3 2001 (2) MPHT 51 (CG) : 2002 Cri. LR 46 (M.P.)

4 2004 (4) MPHT 5 (CG) : 2004 (2) CGLJ 135

(b) the possibility of tampering of evidence by the accused,

(c) the possibility of the accused absconding if released on bail, and lastly,

(d) the delay in conclusion of the trial within a period of 60 days if attributable to the accused.”

9. Considering the principles laid down as above, if the facts are translated in the facts of this case, it would show that considerable delay has been made on the part of the prosecution as even in 14-15 dates, *prima facie*, it appears that the accused/petitioner was not produced before the Court from the jail. Considering the fact that the delay is not attributed because of the petitioner and further taking into the nature of allegations, I am of the opinion that the present is a fit case to release the petitioner/accused under Section 437(6) of Cr.P.C.
10. In the result, the petition is allowed and the orders passed by the Court below are set aside. The petitioner shall be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court. He shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing, unless exempted.

**Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri
Judge**