

CRM-M-16694-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAAT CHANDIGARH

123

CRM-M-16694-2022
Date of decision: 22.04.2022

Sanjay Bakshi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Munish Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sulinder Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
573	12.12.2019	Sector-5, Panchkula	406, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B IPC

1. Challenging the order of proclamation on being declared a proclaimed offender, the petitioner has come up before this court under section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC).
2. The accused could not be served through the ordinary process, including summons, bailable warrants, and even non-bailable warrants. The concerned court finally proceeded against the petitioner under section 82 of CrPC and declared the petitioner a proclaimed offender vide order dated 28-01-2022, passed by Ld. CJM, Panchkula, Haryana.
3. After arguing for considerable time, Id. counsel for the petitioner submits that the criminal justice system must not hamper and suffer because of the petitioner. Thus, would confine the prayers in the petition to grant of bail on the petitioner’s surrendering before the majesty of the concerned court, and reserving liberty to raise the given-up relief in the subsequent petition(s), if the need so arises.
4. Ld. counsel appearing for the State has strenuously opposed this petition, including the limited relief as confined by the petitioner.
5. Given above, this court is confining the adjudication of this matter to the extent mentioned herein before, reserving the liberty to the petitioner as prayed.

CRM-M-16694-2022

6. The petitioner offers the following explanation for non-appearance, in paragraphs 2 & 3 of the petition, which read as follows:

"....2. That FIR got lodged by Anil Kumar alleging that on the pretext of getting the PR of Canada he was cheated but later on during investigation it was found that amount belonged to Sikander who transferred it in the account of Anil Kumar to save it from freezing by investigating agency in the case against his father and got transferred to Canada. It was found that false case got lodged by Anil Kumar against the petitioner and his family.

3. That proclamation was issued on 09.11.2021 as is evident from Annexure P-4, whereas case against petitioner found false much prior which is evident from cancellation report and reply of stated dated 22.10.2021 in CRM-M-41957-2021. Copy of reply is annexed as Annexure P-5. During investigation when petitioner and his family members were found innocent they were told that they were no more required by investigating agency."

7. The primary object of service is to secure the accused's presence in trial. The petitioner has approached this court on its own, which establishes the bonafide at this stage. Without adjudicating the explanation offered and stand taken by the petitioner, this court, in the exercise of its inherent powers under section 482 CrPC, deems it appropriate to grant the following limited relief to the petitioner, subject to the compliance of the conditions mentioned in this order.

8. 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

CRM-M-16694-2022

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.

9. The possibility of the accused henceforth not attending the trial, 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.

10. Without commenting on the case's merits, and in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and also for the reasons mentioned above, the ends of justice would meet with the following order.

11. The petitioner shall surrender before the concerned court within ten days from today. On appearance, the concerned court shall release the petitioner on bail on the same day, subject to furnishing bail bonds to its satisfaction and imposing additional conditions, as it may deem appropriate in the background of the accused's conduct.

12. The petitioner to execute a bond for attendance in the concerned court. On the reverse page of personal bonds, the petitioner shall mention the permanent address, 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.

13. **There shall be a stay of the petitioner's arrest in the case mentioned above for ten days;** however, if the petitioner fails to appear within the time stipulated above, then stay on arrest shall stand vacated without any further reference to this court. It is clarified that if the petitioner appears before the concerned court, then all warrants issued by the concerned court against the petitioner, in the matter mentioned above shall stand recalled and canceled.

14. **Within ten days from today,** the petitioner shall procure a smartphone and inform its IMEI number and other details to the SHO/I.O. of the Police station mentioned before. The petitioner shall always keep the phone location/GPS on the "ON" mode. Whenever the Investigating officer asks to share the location, the

CRM-M-16694-2022

petitioner shall immediately do so. The petitioner shall neither clear the location history, WhatsApp chats, calls nor format the phone without permission of the concerned SHO/I.O. This condition shall continue till the completion of the trial or closure of case, whatever is earlier.

15. **Within ten days from today**, the petitioner shall deposit a sum of rupees ten thousand in 'High Court Lawyers Welfare Fund,' Account number 65018692589, SB, IFCL code SBIN0050306, Branch Code 50306, Branch Address State Bank of India, High Court Branch, Sector 1, Chandigarh. After depositing, the petitioner shall file the proof of deposit, before the concerned court and send its copy alongwith a copy of this order to the Secretary, Punjab & Haryana High Court Bar Association, either in physical or electronic mode.

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 any language that the petitioner understands.

17. 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.

18. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order, 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 partly allowed to the extent mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

22.04.2022
Rittu/anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: NO.