

CRM-M-34282-2021

203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34282-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.01.2022

Kalpana Vats and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Yogesh Goel, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sudhir Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

(Through video conferencing)

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
108	27.07.2021	Rewari Sadar, District Rewari	306/34 IPC

CRM-31978-2021

Application is allowed, as prayed for.
Documents at Annexures P-9 & P-10, are taken on record.

Main case

1. The petitioners apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above have come up before this Court under Section 438 CrPC seeking anticipatory bail.
2. As per bail petition and the response of the State, petitioner No.2 has following criminal history:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offences under Section	Police Station
1	192	2021	420 IPC	Khol
2	354	2019	379B, 384 & 342 IPC	DLF, Gurugram

3. Ld. Counsel for the petitioners further contends that the custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever, and the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioners and family. Learned counsel for the petitioners further argued that although petitioner No.1 had two criminal cases against her but in

CRM-M-34282-2021

one case i.e. FIR No.354/2019, she has been acquitted. In the other case i.e. FIR 192/2021, although there is an allegation of cheating but the amount involved is only Rs.10,000/-. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is handicapped to the extent of 70%.

4. The contention on behalf of the State is that because of the conduct of the petitioners the victim committed suicide and they are not entitled to bail during trial. Learned State counsel also referred to para 7 of the impugned order dated 10.08.2021. The contention of behalf of the complainant is that given the gravity of offence, custodial investigation is required and the petition be dismissed.

REASONING:

5. In Paramjeet Singh v. State of Punjab, CRM-M 50243 of 2021, this court observed,

While considering each bail petition of the accused with a criminal history, it throws an onerous responsibility upon the Courts to act judiciously with reasonableness because arbitrariness is the antithesis of law. The criminal history must be of cases where the accused was convicted, including the suspended sentences and all pending First Information Reports, wherein the bail petitioners stands arraigned as an accused. In reckoning the number of cases as criminal history, the prosecutions resulting in acquittal or discharge, or when Courts quashed the FIR; the prosecution stands withdrawn, or prosecution filed a closure report; cannot be included. Although crime is to be despised and not the criminal, yet for a recidivist, the contours of a playing field are marshy, and graver the criminal history, slushier the puddles.

6. The case of petitioner No.1 is that she is a female and 70% handicapped. Given the accused's health and other factors peculiar to this case, it may be appropriate to afford the petitioners a final opportunity to course-correct. Thus, the previous criminal history of the petitioners is not being considered strictly at this stage as a factor for denying bail. Furthermore, a prima facie perusal of paragraphs 4 to 9 of the bail petition needs consideration for bail. Regarding petitioner No.2, considering the limited role attributed to him, this Court is inclined to grant him bail.

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

CRM-M-34282-2021

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 petitioners who seeks enlargement on bail from the Court. It is true that the gravity of the offence involved is likely to induce the petitioners 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. 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.

9. The petitioner No.1 is a women and is 70% handicapped. Furthermore, she has offered status report supported by an affidavit. She has specifically stated in para 5 of the petition that she purchased a motorcycle and give it to the deceased who was using it. Furthermore, she also gave some money to purchase of a car and she stood as guarantor in the loan documents. Thus, without commenting further, since the petitioner No.1 is a woman and specially disabled, coupled with the nature of allegations and contentions raised by her, the petitioner is also entitled to bail.

CRM-M-34282-2021

10. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioners 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.

11. In Mahidul Sheikh v. State of Haryana, CRM-33030-2021 in CRA-S-363-2020, decided on 14-01-2022, Para 53, this Court observed,

[53]. The pragmatic approach is that while granting bail with sureties, the "Court" and the "Arresting Officer" should give a choice to the accused to either furnish surety bonds or to handover a fixed deposit, or direct electronic money transfer where such facility is available, or creating a lien over his bank account. The accused should also have a further option to switch between the modes. The option lies with the accused to choose between the sureties and deposits and not with the Court or the arresting officer.

12. Given above, In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail in the case mentioned above, subject to his furnishing a personal bond of Rs. Ten Thousand only (INR 10,000/-), and furnishing one surety for Rs. Twenty-Five thousand only (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the concerned Investigator. Before accepting the sureties, the concerned officer must satisfy that if the accused fails to appear in Court, then such surety is capable of producing the petitioners before the Court.

13. In the alternative, the petitioners may furnish a personal bond of Rs. Ten Thousand only (INR 10,000/-), and hand over to the the attesting officer, a fixed deposit(s) for Rs. Ten Thousand only (INR 10,000/-), made in favour of Chief Judicial Magistrate of the concerned district. Such Fixed deposits may be made from any of the banks where the stake of the State is more than 50%, or any of the well-established and stable private banks, with the clause of automatic renewal of principal, and the interest reverting to the linked account. The arresting officer shall give a time of ten working days to enable the accused to prepare a fixed deposit. Such a fixed deposit need not necessarily be made from the applicant's account. If such a fixed deposit is made in physical form, i.e., on paper, then the original receipt shall be handed over to the concerned court. If made online, its printout, countersigned by the accused, shall be given; and the depositor shall get the online liquidation disabled. The applicant shall inform the concerned branch of the bank at the earliest that it has been tendered as surety. Such information be sent either by e-mail or by post/courier about the fixed deposit, whether made on paper or in any other mode, along with its number and FIR number. After that, the applicant shall hand over such proof and endorsement to the concerned police station. Such officer shall have a lien over the deposit until discharged by substitution, and in case any court takes cognizance, then such court, upon which the investigator shall hand over the deposit to such court, which shall have a lien over it

CRM-M-34282-2021

up to the expiry of the period mentioned under S. 437-A CrPC, 1973, or until discharged by substitution as the case may be. If any, subject to the proceedings under S. 446 CrPC, the entire amount of fixed deposit, less taxes if any, shall be endorsed/returned to the depositor.

14. It shall be the total discretion of the applicant to choose between surety bonds and fixed deposits. It shall also be open for the applicant to apply for substitution of fixed deposit with surety bonds and vice-versa.

15. On the reverse page of personal bonds, the attesting officer shall mention the permanent address of the petitioners 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 petitioners shall immediately and not later than 30 days from such modification, intimate about the change to the concerned Police Station and the concerned Court.

16. The petitioners 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.

17. The petitioners 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.

18. Given the nature of allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioners shall surrender all weapons, firearms, ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within 10 days from today and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioners shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal in this case.

19. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioners 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.

CRM-M-34282-2021

20. Any Advocate for the petitioners and the Officer in whose presence the petitioners puts signatures on personal bonds shall explain all conditions of this bail order in any language that the petitioners understands.

21. In case the petitioners 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 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.

22. 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.

23. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offence in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes maximum sentence which is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above, then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioners notice of a minimum of seven days providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

24. 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.

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

26. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioners 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.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

24.01.2022
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.