

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-47492 of 2021
Reserved on : 22.11.2021
Pronounced on : 10.12.2021

Satish ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. Balraj Singh Rathee, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
417	21.11.2020	Sadar Gohana, District Sonipat.	307, 323, 325 and 506 of IPC, 1860

1. The petitioner, incarcerated upon his arrest in FIR captioned above, has come up before this Court seeking regular bail.
2. In Para 10 of the bail petition, learned counsel for the petitioner declares that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents except the FIR mentioned above.
3. On 21.11.2020, the complainant Kuldeep Singh informed the SHO of above mentioned police station in the following terms :-
- He stated that today at about 8.00 a.m. he along with his brother Vinod were present at home. At that time, he indulged in small altercation with Satish (son of his real Chacha). On this, Satish took out a brick and gave a severe brick blow on the head of the complainant's brother. After receiving brick blow, Vinod became unconscious. He along with his family members took him to Civil Hospital, Gohana from where he was referred to PGI, Rohtak. Based on this information, the police registered the FIR captioned above. Subsequently, after the investigation on receiving the medical evidence, the police inserted Section 307 IPC, 1860.
4. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that out of the same occurrence, a cross FIR was registered against the complainant under Sections 323, 334 and 452 of IPC, 1860. He further argued that that the genesis of the occurrence has been suppressed

and the injuries caused by the petitioner have not been properly explained by the complainant. Learned counsel also submits that as per CCTV footage, 5 people had attacked the complainant. He further submits that in the beginning, the FIR was not registered under Section 307 and the petitioner was on bail. Even during the bail, the petitioner did not violate any bail conditions. In the present case, the petitioner is in custody since 10.02.2021. He further contends that incarceration before the proof of guilt would cause grave injustice to the petitioner and family.

5. On the contrary, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and on instructions from SI Mahabir Singh, he submits that recovery has been effected from the petitioner, however the statement of the complainant is yet to be recorded and charges have been framed. The other 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.

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.

8. A perusal of the documents reveals that both the parties were fighting with each other. Even, prima facie, CCTV footage points towards that. Even the complainant has not told the truthful version in the FIR. As per the cross-version registered on the statement of the petitioner, even the accused in the present case has received injuries and a fracture was allegedly found in the spinal cord. Thus, in the FIR, the complainant did not offer any explanation at all about the serious injuries received by the complainant party. Moreover, apart from the present FIR, the petitioner is first time offender and is not involved in any other case, as mentioned in paragraph 10 of the petition. Thus, in the entirety of facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

9. Without commenting on the case's merits, given the investigation stage, the period of incarceration already undergone, nature of allegations and the circumstances peculiar to this case mentioned above, the petitioners makes out a case for release on bail.

10. 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.

11. 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 shall furnish one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/trial Court having the jurisdiction over the Police Station conducting the investigation, and in case of non-availability, any Illaqa 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.

12. The furnishing of the personal bonds shall be deemed acceptance of the

following and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of this bail order.

13. The petitioner 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioner 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.

18. The petitioner shall, under no circumstances, contact, call, text, remarks, stalk, stare, make any gestures, show or express any unusual or inappropriate, verbal or otherwise objectionable behaviour, to or in front of the victim, either physically or through any other mode, or roam around the victim's home, and shall also stay away 1 km. from the radius of residence of the victim.

19. 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.

20. In case the petitioner 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.

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

22. 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.

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

24. *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.*

25. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the petition is allowed in the terms mentioned above.

{ANOOP CHITKARA}
JUDGE

10th day of December, 2021
Manpreet

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