

CRM-M-25750-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25750-2022
Reserved on: 24.04.2023
Pronounced on: 22.05.2023

Ram Snehi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. J.S. Thind, Advocate for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
128	09.05.2021	Adampur, District Hisar	304-B, 34 IPC

1. The petitioner, who was mother-in-law of the deceased, incarcerating upon his arrest in the FIR captioned above, came up before this Court under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC) seeking bail.
2. In paragraph 12 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.
3. Petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions. The petitioner contends that the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.
4. The State opposes bail.

REASONING:

5. The complaint's statement has been recorded during the trial and it reads as follows:

" My daughter Usha (since deceased) was earlier married to Rohtash son of Raja Ram, resident of village Bosti prior to her marriage with the Dhruv son of Jitender and Ram Snehi (present accused). It is correct that Rohtash was died in a motor vehicular accident in the year 2017. One daughter was born out from the wedlock of Rohtash and Usha.

After the death of Rohtash, my daughter Usha was thrown out by the members of her matrimonial house keeping her daughter with them. Thereafter, Usha started residing with her maternal uncle namely Balwant and Dalbir. It is correct that my daughter Usha was remained under depression for her daughter as the family of her deceased husband Rohtash did not allow her to meet her daughter or to hand over the custody of her daughter to Usha. In this regard number of panchayats were convened, but to no avail. Due to the said reason, my daughter Usha remained under severe depression and she also used to take the medicines of the depression. It is correct that the above said fact that the Usha is under depression for want of her daughter, was not disclosed to the accused persons as well as Dhruv. We also advised Usha for not to take the medicine of depression and she did accordingly. The marriage of Usha with Dhruv was exchange marriage as the cousin sister of Dhruv was married with the son of maternal uncle of Usha on the very same day. The marriage was simple and no dowry articles or gifts were exchanged in the said marriage. Accused persons never demanded any dowry from my daughter Usha. They never harassed or beaten by the accused persons for the demand of dowry. They never treated Usha with cruelty for demand of dowry. Usha and her husband Dhruv were residing in a separate house from the present accused and they were maintaining their separate kitchen. It is correct that my statement was recorded in the court on 31.10.2022. Self stated that I had given the said statement under the pressure of my relatives and other family members. It is correct that my daughter Usha had committed suicide due to depression and the acced persons have no hand or role in the commission of her suicide. After receiving the information of death of Ushis, I alongwith other family members reached at the matrimonial house of Usha 1 had seen the dead body of Usha No suicide note was available with her at that time. I do not know anything about the recovery of alleged suicide note. Police never show me the alleged suicide note. It is correct that Ex.P7, Ex.P10 and Ex.P11 are bears my signatures. Self stated that the police had obtained my signatures on the blank papers. It is correct that earlier in my statement recorded on 31.10.2022. wherein, I had admitted that the police had prepared the above said documents in my presence and obtained my signatures. Self stated that it was deposed by me only due to the pressure of my relatives and police. I never handed over note book stated to be pertaining to Usha and my affidavit to the police. It is further correct that statement Ex.P5 bears my signature at Point-A. Self stated that the police has obtained my signatures on the blank papers. I did not made any statement Ex.P5 to the police. Earlier admission of making of statement Ex.P5 to the police in my examination-in-chief was only due to the pressure of police and my relatives. Today I am deposing voluntarily without any force, pressure, threat, inducement or undue influence from any corner.”

6. As per paragraph 7 of the bail petition, the petitioner is in custody since 18-09-2021. Given the statement of complainant coupled with the pre-trial custody, coupled with the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage, subject to the compliance of terms and conditions mentioned in this order.

CRM-M-25750-2022

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. 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.

10. In **Mahidul Sheikh v. State of Haryana**, Neutral Citation No: 2022:PHHC:003277, [Para 53], [Law Finder Doc Id # 1933969], 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.

11. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, in the following terms:

(a). Petitioner to furnish personal bond of Rs. Ten thousand (INR 10,000/-); AND

(b) To give one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the concerned court, and in case of non-availability, any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned court must satisfy that if the accused fails to appear in court, then such surety can produce the accused before the court.

OR

(b) Petitioner to hand over to the concerned court a fixed deposit for Rs. Ten Thousand only (INR 10,000/-), with the clause of automatic renewal of the principal and the interest reverting to the linked account, made in favor of the 'Chief Judicial Magistrate' of the concerned district. Said fixed deposit 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 sector banks. The fixed deposit need not necessarily be made from the petitioner's account.

(c). Such court shall have a lien over the deposit until the case's closure or discharged by substitution, or up to the expiry of the period mentioned under S. 437-A CrPC, 1973, and at that stage, 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.

(d). It shall be the total discretion of the petitioner to choose between surety bond and fixed deposit. It shall also be open for the petitioner to apply to the Investigator or the concerned court to substitute the fixed deposit with surety bonds and vice-versa.

(e). On the reverse page of personal bond, the petitioner shall mention her/his permanent address along with the phone number, preferably that number which is linked with the AADHAR, 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.

(f). The petitioner is 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 declarations made in the bail petition and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and also of this bail order.

CRM-M-25750-2022

12. 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.

13. Given the nature of the 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 fifteen days from release from prison 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, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules.

14. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioner 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 remain in force throughout the trial and after that in Section 437-A of the Cr.P.C., if not canceled due to non-appearance or breach of conditions.

15. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavour that the accused reforms and does not indulge in violent or cunning behaviour. In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi, Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

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. If the petitioner finds bond amount beyond social and financial reach, it may be brought to the notice of this Court for appropriate reduction. Further, if the petitioner finds 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

CRM-M-25750-2022

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.

18. 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.

19. 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 petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

20. 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.

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

22. *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.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

22.05.2023
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.