

143 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27208-2022
Date of Decision: 23.06.2022

Pushpa Jain ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
131	07.03.2021	Rohtak City, District Rohtak	420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC (467, 468, 471 IPC deleted later on)

1. The petitioner, arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, has come up before this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashing of the FIR and all consequential proceedings arising thereto and 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 (Cr.P.C).
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 Cr.P.C and declared the petitioner a proclaimed offender vide order dated 07.01.2022, passed by Ld. CJM Rohtak.
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.

6. The petitioner offers the explanation for non-appearance that she was unaware of the dates.

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 Cr.P.C, 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 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 until July 08, 2022;** 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. **It is clarified that if the petitioner fails to appear before the concerned court within above mentioned time limit, then this order shall stand recalled automatically under section 362 read with 482 CrPC, without any furtherance reference to this court.**

14. **By July 08, 2022,** the petitioner shall deposit a sum of rupees ten thousand in 'High Court Lawyers Welfare Fund,' Account number 65018692589, IFSC 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. *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

23.06.2022

Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	NO.