

CRM-M-58089-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58089-2022

Reserved on: 05.01.2023

Pronounced on: 11.01.2023

Rattan Lal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Naveen Kashyap, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rahul Jaswal, Advocate for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
561	21.09.2020	Chandni Bagh, Panipat	148, 149, 323 & 302 IPC

1. The petitioner, incarcerated upon his arrest in the FIR captioned above, came up before this Court under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Cr.P.C.) seeking bail.
2. The petitioner is silent about criminal history, however the State does not dispute that he had any criminal history.
3. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family. He submits that stringent conditions be imposed he would have no objection.
4. Counsel representing the State opposes the bail on merits and he further asserted that the State is providing adequate and comfortable facilities in the prison for the older people.

REASONING:

5. The petitioner is aged 82 years and allegations against the petitioner are that he along with co-accused gave beatings to the deceased with sticks and bats. In the FIR it

CRM-M-58089-2022

is specifically mentioned that Suraj and Harish inflicted injuries on the deceased with sharp edge weapon, whereas, Rattan Lal (present petitioner), Kalu and Sonu gave beatings with sticks and bats. Although the victim could have died just because of beatings with sticks and bats but the fact is that the petitioner is aged 82 years and it would be extremely unfair to presume that in the present case 82 years old indian male had strength to inflict such blow which would be sufficient to cause death. Thus, in the entirety of allegations in the light of the petitioner's age, he is entitled to bail.

6. In Habib v. State of Haryana, CRM-M-26522-2022, decided on 19-07-2022, this court had observed as follows,

[8]. The weapon of offence attributed to the petitioner, who is an octogenarian, is a lathi. It is a matter of common knowledge that older people often make use of lathis/dandas in their routine life to aid their movements. Increasing age presents itself with complications such as postural deformities and decreased sensory input. Use of stick as an external support increases physical and psychological abilities. A large number of elders are dependant entirely on these sticks for balance and stability. Apart from the assistance in walking, these sticks also help them to dispel or protect themselves against stray, rabid or dangerous animals. In the present case, when the alleged offence was committed the petitioner was of the age where it can be safely assumed that he was in possession of a lathi as a means to support his body as opposed to a weapon intended to kill a person. Further, as per the status report, the other coaccuseds were armed with farsa, axe and iron rods. The petitioner is only attributed a danda blow which, in the light of the medical report, cannot be reasonably presumed to have caused the death of the victim.

[10]. As per the latest World Development Indicators, the life expectancy at birth for an Indian resident averages 69.887 years. Prison Statistics India 2020, compiled by the National Crime Records Bureau (Ministry of Home Affairs), Government of India, reveals that very few States provide special treatment or facilities for old age prisoners. The purpose of sentencing is two-fold: deterrence and retribution; and is intended to send a strong message to the people not to violate the law enacted by the State, simultaneously consoling and assuring the victims of the justice system put in place by the State and preventing the takeover of law into their own hands. However, this entire exercise loses its purpose when such an older person is involved. Reformation to re-enter the society as an objective of prisons becomes futile as the person is on the last leg of the life. Further, an old person cannot be meted out harsh treatments to give an example to the society as it would tantamount to cruelty. Mere existence in confinement seems more challenging than living without special arrangements and psychological support of family members for such persons. Thus, would it be justifiable to deny bail to a centenarian, nonagenarian, or octogenarian? It can have just one answer: a thunderous NO anywhere in the globe. The only exceptions are extreme perversity, extremely

CRM-M-58089-2022

heinous crime, mass slaughters, or recidivists who refuse to mend their ways to blend with the community without disrupting the social order. Thus, it is hazardous to deny bail to people over a particular age, and there is a need to be sensitized about the sufferings associated with old age, realizing that sending these older people to jails or prisons serves no purpose whatsoever, for whom so ever, wheresoever. In the background of these peculiar facts, coupled with the petitioner being 81 years, date of birth as per AADHAR Card 12-5-1941, the Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. 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 elaborate 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.

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 elaborate 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, 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 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.

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. Till the completion of the trial, the petitioner shall not contact, call, text, message, remark, stare, stalk, make any gestures or express any unusual or inappropriate, verbal or otherwise objectionable behavior towards the victim's family, either physically, or through phone call or any other social media, through any other mode, nor shall

unnecessarily roam around the victim's home.

15. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and the residence of the victim's family and shall also not enter within a radius of five-hundred meters from the victim's home till the recording of the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation, 2018 All SCR (Crl.) 458; and Aparna Bhatt v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

16. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioner 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 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.

17. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavour that the accused does not repeat the offence and to ensure the safety of the witnesses, victim, and their families. 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."

18. 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.

19. 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 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.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. 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.

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

25. *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

11.01.2023
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.