

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42772 of 2021
Reserved on : 08.11.2021
Pronounced on :10.11.2021

Virender @ Ladda ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sushil Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
237	23.10.2020	Rohtak Civil Lines, District Rohtak.	379-A,412 and 120-B of IPC, 1860.

The petitioner, incarcerated upon his arrest in FIR captioned above, has come up before this Court seeking regular bail.

2. The cumulative reading of Para 5 of the bail petition, status report and the order passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak mentions the following criminal history of the petitioner:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offences Under Section(s)	Police Station
1.	331	05.10.2020	379-A, 411, 34 of IPC	Urban Estate Rohtak
2.	348	05.10.2020	379-A, 411, 120-B, 34 of IPC	Arya Nagar, Rohtak
3.	223	11.10.2020	379-A, 412, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
4.	224	11.10.2020	379-A, 412, 201, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
5.	349	11.10.2020	379-A, 411, 34 of IPC	Urban Estate, Rohtak

6.	350	11.10.2020	379-A, 411, 34 of IPC	Urban Estate, Rohtak
7.	333	05.10.2020	379-A, 411, 34 of IPC	Urban Estate, Rohtak
8.	236	23.10.2020	379-A, 412, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
9.	373	02.11.2020	379-A, 411, 34 of IPC	Arya Nagar, Rohtak
10.	252	04.11.2020	379-A, 201, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
11.	332	05.10.2020	379-A, 411, 34 of IPC	Urban Estate, Rohtak
12.	253	05.11.2020	379-A, 201, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
13.	256	06.11.2020	379-A, 412, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
14.	257	06.11.2020	379-A, 201, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
15.	258	07.11.2020	379-A, 412, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak
16.	739	07.11.2020	379-A, 412, 120-B, 34 of IPC	Shivaji Colony, Rohtak
17.	267	06.11.2020	379-A of IPC, 1860	PGIMS, Rohtak
18.	90	26.08.2010	379 of IPC	GRP, Hisar
19.	323	16.12.2009	379 of IPC	C.Line, BWN
20.	164	07.08.2010	216, 411, 379 of IPC	Charkhi Dadri
21.	724	14.11.2011	13-3-67 of G. ACT	City Rohtak
22.	663	04.10.2001	61/1/14 Excise Act	City Rohtak
23.	228	16.07.2005	457, 380 of IPC	City Hansi
24.	163	26.05.2005	379 of IPC	City Hansi
25.	237	23.10.2020	379-A, 412, 120-B of IPC	Civil Lines, Rohtak

3. Briefly, the allegations against the petitioner are that on 23.10.2020, the complainant informed the above captioned police station that at about 7.30 p.m., he along with his wife were coming from Sonipat Stand, Rohtak. His wife was a pillion rider. When they reached at Mansarovar Park, Rohtak, then two young boys came from wrong side on a Scooty and snatched gold chain of my wife weighing 2 tolas and ran away. Based on these allegations, the Police registered the FIR mentioned above. During investigation, the police found the involvement of the petitioner and arrested him.

4. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that incarceration before the proof of guilt would cause grave injustice to the petitioner and family.

5. On the contrary, the contention on behalf of the State is that if this Court is inclined to grant bail, then such a bond must be subject to very stringent conditions.

6. The possibility of the accused influencing the investigation, tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses, and the likelihood of fleeing justice, can be taken care of by imposing elaborative and stringent conditions. In *Sushila Aggarwal*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions.

REASONING:

7. In *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v State of Punjab*, 1980 (2) SCC 565, (Para 30), a Constitutional Bench of Supreme Court held that the bail decision must enter the cumulative effect of the variety of circumstances justifying the grant or refusal of bail. In *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav*, 2005 (2) SCC 42, (Para 18) a three-member Bench of Supreme Court held that the persons accused of non-bailable offences are entitled to bail if the Court concerned concludes that the prosecution has failed to establish a prima facie case against him, or despite the existence of a prima facie case, the Court records reasons for its satisfaction for the need to release such person on bail, in the given fact situations. The rejection of bail does not preclude filing a subsequent application. The courts can release on bail, provided the circumstances then prevailing requires, and a change in the fact situation. In *State of Rajasthan v Balchand*, AIR 1977 SC 2447, (Para 2 & 3), Supreme Court noticeably illustrated that the basic rule might perhaps be tersely put as bail, not jail, except where there are circumstances suggestive of fleeing from justice or thwarting the course of justice or creating other troubles in the shape of repeating offences or intimidating witnesses and the like by the petitioner who seeks enlargement on bail from the Court. It is true that the gravity of the offence involved is likely to induce the petitioner to avoid the course of justice and must weigh when considering the question of jail. So also, the heinousness of the crime. In *Gudikanti Narasimhulu v Public Prosecutor*, (1978) 1 SCC 240, (Para 16), Supreme Court held that the delicate light of the law favors release unless countered by the negative criteria necessitating that course. In *Prahlad Singh Bhati v NCT, Delhi*, (2001) 4 SCC 280, Supreme Court highlighted one of the factors for bail to be the public or the State's immense interest and similar other considerations. In *Dataram Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh*, (2018) 3 SCC 22, (Para 6), Supreme Court held that the grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously, compassionately, and in a humane manner. Also, conditions for the grant of bail

ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.

8. The possibility of the accused influencing the investigation, tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses, and the likelihood of fleeing justice, can be taken care of by imposing elaborative and stringent conditions. In *Sushila Aggarwal*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions.

9. Although, the petitioner is a history sheeter and appears to be involved in similar types of cases, however, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case and keeping in view the age of the accused, this Court is affording one final opportunity to the petitioner to reform and mend his ways.

10. Without commenting on the case's merits, given the investigation stage, the period of incarceration already undergone, and the circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioners make a case for release on bail.

11. Given the above reasoning, the Court is granting bail to the petitioners, subject to strict terms and conditions, which shall be over and above and irrespective of the contents of the form of bail bonds in chapter XXXIII of Cr.P.C., 1973.

12. The petitioners shall be released on bail in the FIR mentioned above, subject to furnishing a personal bond of Rs. Ten thousand (INR 10,000/-), and shall furnish one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the Special Judge/Judicial Magistrate having the jurisdiction over the Police Station conducting the investigation, and in case of non-availability, any Illaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the sureties, the concerned Court must satisfy that in case the petitioners-accused fail to appear in Court, then such sureties are capable to produce the petitioners-accused before the Court, keeping in mind the Jurisprudence behind the sureties, which is to secure the presence of the accused.

13. The furnishing of the personal bonds shall be deemed acceptance of the following and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of this bail order.

14. The petitioners to execute a bond for attendance to the concerned Court(s). Once the trial begins, the petitioner shall not, in any manner, try to delay the proceedings, and undertakes to appear before the concerned Court and to attend the trial on each date, unless exempted. In case of an appeal, on this very bond, the petitioners also promise to appear before the higher Court in terms of Section 437-A Cr.P.C.

15. The attesting officer shall, on the reverse page of personal bonds, mention the permanent address of the petitioner along with the phone number(s), WhatsApp number (if any), e-mail (if any), and details of personal bank account(s) (if available), and in case of any change, the petitioner shall immediately and not later

than 30 days from such modification, intimate about the change of residential address and change of phone numbers, WhatsApp number, e-mail accounts, to the Police Station of this FIR to the concerned Court.

16. The petitioners shall not influence, browbeat, pressurize, make any inducement, threat, or promise, directly or indirectly, to the witnesses, the Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts of the case, to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police, or the Court, or to tamper with the evidence.

17. The petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer; and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as may be required. In the event of failure to do so, it will be open for the prosecution to seek cancellation of the bail. Whenever the investigation occurs within the police premises, the petitioners shall not be called before 8 AM and shall be let off before 5 PM, and shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

18. Given the gravity of accusations and the heinous nature of the offence, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within 30 days from today and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal in this case.

19. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioners repeat or commits any offence where the sentence prescribed is more than seven years or violates any condition as stipulated in this order, it shall always be permissible to the respondent to apply for cancellation of this bail. It shall further be open for any investigating agency to bring it to the notice of the Court seized of the subsequent application that the accused was earlier cautioned not to indulge in criminal activities. Otherwise, the bail bonds shall continue to remain in force throughout the trial and after that in terms of Section 437-A of the Cr.P.C.

20. Any Advocate for the petitioners and the Officer in whose presence the petitioners put signatures on personal bonds shall explain all conditions of this bail order, in vernacular and if not feasible, in Hindi.

21. In case the petitioners find the bail condition(s) as violating fundamental, human, or other rights, or causing difficulty due to any situation, then for modification of such term(s), the petitioners may file a reasoned application before this Court, and after taking cognizance, even to the Court taking cognizance or the trial Court, as the case may be, and such Court shall also be competent to modify or delete any condition.

22. This order does not, in any manner, limit or restrict the rights of the Police or the investigating agency from further investigation per law.
23. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the merits of the case, nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.
24. In return for the protection from incarceration, the Court believes that the petitioners-accused shall also reciprocate through desirable behavior.
25. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order for furnishing bonds. Any Advocate for the petitioners can download this order along with the case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. The Prosecutor shall also verify the downloaded copy by comparing it from the official web page. In case the attesting officer or the Court wants to verify the authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.*
26. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the petition is allowed in the terms mentioned above.

{ANOOP CHITKARA}
JUDGE

10 th Day of November, 2021
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/ No
Whether reportable	Yes /No