

CRM-M-51775-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51775-2022
Reserved on: 24.01.2023
Pronounced on: 30.01.2023

Paramjit Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Vikas Mehsempuri, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Virat Rana, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
54	13.08.2022	Bakshiwala, Tehsil and District Patiala	406 & 420 IPC

- Both women, apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above, on the allegations of misappropriating paddy worth Rs. 65 Lacs, had come up before this Court under Section 438 CrPC seeking anticipatory bail.
- In paragraph 16 of the bail petition, the accused declare that they have no criminal antecedents.
- Petitioners' counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions. Petitioners' counsel argued that the custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever, and the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioners and family.
- State's counsel opposes the bail.

REASONING:

- The complainant alleged that the petitioners' firm misappropriated 6174 bags of paddy weighing 2315.250 quintals, causing a loss of Rs. 64, 21, 833 to Markfed. The petitioners' stand in para 4 of the bail application reads as follows:

"4. That it is to be mentioned here that before 31.07.2022 petitioners had already send two trucks of rice bags i.e. 1160 bags on 29.07.2022 from the petitioners mill to the Radhe Godown wherein the bags of rice was dumped but the same was rejected on 30.07.2022 with contract no.

CRM-M-51775-2022

5120 and 5121 and on 30.07.2022 three trucks of bag loaded for Radhe Godown for total numbers of bag i.e. 1740 bags of rice from the mill to the Radhe Godown and the three of the trucks bearing no.PB5516, R4140 and 20097 were standing out of the godown and they were not allowed to dumped the rice in the godown and even the two trucks of rice in vehicle no. RR0342 and PB5516 which were send on 29.07.2022 to the Radhe Godown were received back with rejection on 27.10.2022 with vehicle no. PB 9117 and PB1651. The technical assistant on 30.07.2022 rejected the two trucks with contract no. 5120 and 5121 and even not allowed to dumped the rice of the remaining three trucks standing out of the godown send from the mill of the petitioners to the Radhe Godown. So, before time bound date i.e. 31.07.2022 petitioners had already delivered two trucks on 29.07.2022 and three trucks on 30.07.2022, whereas the two trucks has been allowed to dump but lateron rejected and another three trucks were not allowed to dumped the rice in the godown, so in this regard the alleged checking done on 05.07.2022 is totally without any sufficient cause false allegation has been levelled against the petitioners with regard to missing of bags. The copies of the gate pass dated: 29.07.2022 with GR No. 230 and 231, the gate pass dated 30.07.2022 and 31.07.2022 with GR No. 232, 233 and 235, rejection note of Sr. No. 20, 21 dated 30.07.2022 and gate pass dated 27.10.2022 of Gr. No. 236 and 237 are **Annexure P-3 to P-11.**"

6. Given the penal provisions imposed and the sentence provided by the Legislature, the nature of allegations coupled with the fact that the petitioners are first offenders, and one of the relevant factors would be to provide an opportunity to course-correct. Even a prima facie perusal of paragraph 4 of the bail petition needs consideration for 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 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

CRM-M-51775-2022

of justice and must weigh when considering the question of jail. So also, the heinousness of the crime. In GudikantiNarasimhulu 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. 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.

10. In Mahidul Sheikh v. State of Haryana, CRM-33030-2021 in CRA-S-363-2020, decided on 14-01-2022, 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 petitioners are not required in any other case, the petitioners shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, in the following terms:

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

(b) To give one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-) each, to the satisfaction of the concerned investigator/SHO. Before accepting the surety, the concerned officer must satisfy that if the accused fail to appear in court, then such surety can produce such accused before the court.

OR

(b) Petitioners to hand over to the concerned investigator/SHO a fixed deposit for Rs. Ten Thousand only (INR 10,000/-) each, with the clause of automatic renewal of the principal and the interest reverting to the linked account, made in favour of the 'Chief Judicial Magistrate' of the concerned district. The 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 petitioners's account.

(c). In case of the launching of the prosecution, the said fixed deposit be forwarded to the concerned court along with the police report/challan under 173 CrPC.

(d). 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.

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

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

(g). The petitioners 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.

12. The petitioners is directed to join the investigation within seven days and also as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioners shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act. The petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer; and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, it will be open for the prosecution to seek cancellation of the bail. Whenever the investigation occurs within the police premises, the petitioners shall not be called before 8 AM, let off before 6 PM, and shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

CRM-M-51775-2022

13. 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.

14. Within fifteen days from today, the petitioners shall forward to the Investigator/SHO and the complainant the complete details of bank account numbers with addresses, fixed deposits, DEMAT account numbers, the current market value of jewelry, sovereign metals, all precious articles, held either individually or jointly, and cash-in-hand, by way of separate notarized affidavits. ***If the petitioners fail to comply with this condition, then on this ground alone the bail might be canceled, and the complainant may file any such application for the cancellation of bail, and State shall file the said application.***

15. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioners repeat or commit 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.

16. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this Court are to endeavour that the accused does not repeat the offence and to provide an opportunity to the victim to consider legal remedies for recovery of the amount. 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." 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.”

17. Any Advocate for the petitioners and the Officer in whose presence the petitioners put signatures on personal bonds shall explain all conditions of this bail order in any language that the petitioners understand.
18. If the petitioners 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 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.
19. 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.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. In return for the protection from incarceration, the Court believes that the accused shall also reciprocate through desirable behavior.
23. 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 complainantMarkfedwithout any delay. If the complainant notices any violation of this order, they may inform the SHO of the concerned police station, the trial court, or even this court.
24. *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

30.01.2023
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.