

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51979-2021
Reserved on 17.12.2021
Pronounced on:22.12.2021

Shiva ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Rishi Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
907	22.09.2021	Sadar Karnal, District Karnal	323, 324, 452, 506, 34 IPC 1860 and 307, 201 IPC 1860 added later on

1. The petitioner, aged 19 years, incarcerated upon his arrest in the FIR captioned above, came up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.
2. The status report also does not mention any criminal antecedents of the accused.
3. It is for the first time that the petitioner has approached this Court for anticipatory bail.
4. Briefly, the allegations against the petitioner are that the complainant alleged that on 21.09.2021 at 8:15 pm, he was going for taking food at the house of his sister and when he reached there, then Shiva raised *lalkara* by saying that they would teach him a lesson for not giving them liquor. After that, he was given a blow with sharp edge knife on the chest and the petitioner also gave him filthy abuses. The other details are not necessary for the purpose of deciding the present petition.
5. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a young boy of just 19 years of age and has no criminal antecedents. He further contends that custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever, and the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.
6. The contention on behalf of the State is that petitioner is the main accused and in case he is released, there is possibility that he may threaten the witnesses.

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 offence is very heinous in nature and the petitioner is the main accused, who caused a wound with knife on the right side of mid sternum of the injured. However, another fact is that the petitioner is a young boy and in the formative years of age coupled with the fact that he is in custody for around 03 months and that he can study well and become a good human being. In the facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is inclined to give bail to the petitioner with stringent conditions. It is clarified that if the petitioner violates even a single condition, then it shall be open for the complainant as well for the State to file cancellation petition before this Court or before the trial Court.

10. The petitioner is a first offender and thus deserves an opportunity to course correct.

11. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for 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 CrPC, 1973.

12. Provided the accused is not required in any other case, 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 Special Judge/Judicial Magistrate having the jurisdiction over the Police Station conducting the investigation, and in case of non-availability, any Ilaqa 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. On the reverse page of personal bonds, the attesting officer shall mention the permanent address of the petitioner along with the phone number linked with the AADHAR card, the other phone numbers (if any), and e-mail (if any). In case of any change in the above particulars, the petitioner shall immediately and not later than 30 days from such modification, intimate about the change to the concerned Police Station and the concerned Court.

14. The petitioner to also execute a bond for attendance in the concerned Court(s), as and when asked to do so. The presentation of the personal bond shall be deemed acceptance of the following and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of this bail order.

15. 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.

16. 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 and the circumstances of the case, to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police, or the Court, or to tamper with the evidence.

17. Given the nature of allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, 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.

18. Till the completion of the trial, the petitioner shall not contact, call, text, message, remark, stare, stalk, make any gestures or express any unusual or inappropriate, verbal or otherwise objectionable behavior towards the victim and victim's family, either physically, or through phone call or any other social media, through any other mode, nor shall unnecessarily roam around the victim's home.

19. Given the nature of allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter within a radius of one kilometer from the victim's home till the completion of the trial. Reference be made to Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation, 2018 All SCR (Crl.) 458); and Aparna Bhatt v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

20. 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. The petitioner shall bring it to the notice of the concerned court seized of the subsequent application about earlier caution 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.

21. 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 any language that the petitioner understands.

22. 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.

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

24. The SHO of the concerned Police Station or the Investigating Officer shall arrange to send a copy of this order, preferably a soft copy, to the complainant and the victim, within two days. In case the victim notices stalking or any violation of this order, he may either inform the SHO of the concerned Police Station or the Trial Court or even this Court.

25. 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.

26. The Court believes that the accused shall reciprocate the bail through desirable behavior.

27. *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.*

Petition allowed in aforesaid terms. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

22.12. 2021
sonia arora

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No