

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M No.44949 of 2021
Date of Decision:October 28, 2021

Arvind Kumar MishraPetitioner

Vs.

State of HaryanaRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

ANOOP CHITKARA J. (ORAL)

FIR	Date	Police Station	Sections
111/2021	18.04.2021	NIT Faridabad, Haryana	323, 324, 427, 506, 34 IPC and Section 3 of Medicare Service Person and Medicate Service Institutions (Prevention of Damage of Property) Act, 2008

The petitioner, apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above, came up before this Court under Section 438 Cr.P.C., seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In Para No.10 of the bail application, the petitioner declares having no criminal history. Ld. Counsel for the bail petitioner states on instructions that the petitioner has no criminal past relating to the offences prescribing sentence of seven years and more, or when on conviction, the sentence imposed was more than three years. The status report also does not mention any criminal past of the accused.

3. Briefly, the allegations against the petitioner are that on 16-04-2021, the Director of hospital (name withheld) informed the police that one person was brought to the hospital. He was severely affected by Covid-19 disease and his oxygen level was very low, vitals were also on the lower parameters. The Doctors tried to resuscitate but could not save him. After that the family members and relatives of the patient vandalized the hospital, misbehaved with the staff and even inappropriately touched

the female staff members. The complainant also stated that the incidents have been captured in the CCTV cameras. Subsequently, the injured persons were given treatment and matter was informed which led to the registration of the FIR mentioned above.

4. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever and incarceration before the proof of guilt would cause grave injustice to the petitioner and his family.

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

REASONING:

6. 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.

7. 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. In *Sumit Mehta v. State of N.C.T. of Delhi*, (2013)15 SCC 570, Para 11, Supreme Court holds that while exercising power Under Section 438 of the Code, the Court is duty-bound to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal freedom and the right of investigation of the police. While exercising utmost restraint, the Court can impose conditions countenancing its object as permissible under the law to ensure an uninterrupted and unhampered investigation.

8. Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad dismissed the bail petition on the grounds that the relatives misbehaved with the medical staff and such persons need to be dealt with iron hand.

9. The observations of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad that such persons need to be dealt with iron hand are undoubtedly justified but at the stage of post conviction not at the stage when allegations are yet to be tested and proved in

accordance with law during the trial.

10. Given the fact that the accused were not in their mental balance due to the loss of life and also given the fact that there was a widespread apprehension about the deficiency of the medical services provided to Covid-19 patient, there is no reason to put them in prison. There is no reason to deny the present bail petition.

11. Given the nature of allegations, no pre-trial incarceration is required. Without commenting on the case's merits and the circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner makes a case for release on bail, subject to the following 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 petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR mentioned above, subject to furnishing a personal bond of Rs. Ten thousand (INR 10,000/-), and with one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the Investigator. Before accepting the surety, the Attesting Officer must satisfy that in case the accused fails to appear in Court, then such sureties are capable to produce the 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 bond shall be deemed acceptance of the following and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of this bail order:

a) The petitioner to execute a bond for attendance in 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 petitioner also promises to appear before the higher Court in terms of Section 437-A Cr.P.C.

b) 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.

c) The petitioner 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.

d) The petitioner 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 petitioner 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.

14. 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.

15. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioner repeats 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.

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

17. In case the petitioner finds 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 petitioner 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.

18. This order does not, in any manner, limit or restrict the rights of the Police or the investigating agency from further investigation per law.

19. 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.

20. In return for the protection from incarceration, the Court believes that the accused shall also reciprocate through desirable behavior.

21. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. In case the attesting officer wants to verify the authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.*

22. The Petition is allowed in the above terms.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

October 28, 2021
sonia arora

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No