

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPURMCRC No. 1290 of 2019

- Jayas Valde S/o Prahlad Valde Aged About 23 Years R/o Risama, Aamgaon, Tahsil- Aamgaon, District- Gondia, Maharashtra., District : Gondiya *, Maharashtra

---- Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station- Chhuriya, District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh., District : Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Aditya Bharadwaj, Advocate.

For Non-applicant : Ms. S. Mishra, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sharad Kumar Gupta

Order On Board08.03.2019

1. This is first bail application under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. preferred by the applicant before this Court and no other bail application is pending before any other Court.
2. Perused the case diary provided by the learned counsel for the State in connection with crime No. 87/2018 registered at Police Station – Chhuriya, District- Rajnandgaon (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 394 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Case of the prosecution, in brief is that complainant Ganga Ram Sen was Sangam Manager of Bharat Finance Inclusion Limited, finance company branch at Dongargarh. On 12.06.2018 at about 1:30 pm he was returning back from village Dumardih to Dongargarh by motorcycle

after recovering loan installments from the debtors. 1 km ahead to village Dumardih 3 unknown persons came in a motorcycle. 2 persons had covered their mouth by scarf. One another unknown person also came by the motorcycle thrown chilli powder on the eyes of the complainant, those persons snatched cash Rs. 88,008/- and one tablet of Samsung company from the complainant and ran away. On the memorandum of the applicant Rs. 3360/- and one mobile had been seized from him.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has no criminal background. He is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case, therefore, he shall be released on bail.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application , however, submits that there is no antecedent against the applicant.
6. There is no such prima facie evidence on record that allegedly amount seized from the applicant is the subject matter of stolen cash.
7. As per the Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, an accused of any offence gives some information in custody and in consequence thereof, any fact is discovered then such portion of the information is admissible as is distinctly relates to the discovery. Such information may confessional or not.
8. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Madhu- v- State of Kerala** [(2012) 2 SCC 399] has laid down the following judicial precedent :-

“Relevance of the confessional statements would depend on the discovery of facts based on the information supplied by the accused. If any fresh facts have been discovered on the basis of the confessional statement made by the accused, the same would be relevant. If not, the confessional statement cannot be proved against the accused, to the detriment of the accused.”

9. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Jitendra Kumar -v -State of**

Haryana [(2012) 6 SCC 204] has laid down the following judicial precedent :-

“What has been recorded in Ext.P43 cannot be taken to be confession of the accused in relation to commission of the crime, but the other part by which the motor cycle was recovered, would be the portion admissible in evidence. The admissible part can very safely be segregated from the inadmissible part in this statement.”

10. Looking to the provision of Section 27 of the Evidence Act and aforesaid judicial precedents laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madhu** (supra) and **Jitendra Kumar** (supra), this Court finds that the information given by an accused through memorandum is admissible in evidence to such extent it relates to the discovery of some incriminating article.

11. The Sessions Judge, Rajnandgaon overlooked this well settled legal principle which he should have considered.

12. Looking to these facts and circumstances of the case, though 11 other criminal cases have have been registered against the applicant but looking to the evidence available on record against the applicant, It is directed that if the applicant furnishes one solvent surety for a sum of Rs.25,000/- along with a personal bond in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court with the condition that he will appear before the Trial Court at 11:00 am as and when directed till trial and he would cooperate during the trial, he shall be released on bail.

13. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-

(Sharad Kumar Gupta)
JUDGE