

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

219

CRM-M-297-2023

Date of Decision : 12.01.2023

Mahender @ Kala

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.Manish Soni, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, through instant petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., is seeking regular bail in FIR No. 38 dated 10.02.2022 under Sections 376, 377, 343, 328, 354, 120B, 511, 506, 376D, 376(2)(n) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner is staying in the locality where Shiv Mandir is located and alleged offence was committed. There is no allegation against the petitioner of commission of alleged offence. The allegation against the petitioner is that while alleged offence was committed by co-accused Baba Kapilgiri, the petitioner was present and he prepared tea and guarded the room. The petitioner is in custody since 21.02.2022. The petitioner is an agriculturist.

The prosecutrix has already been examined and her statement is in tone with

allegations made in the FIR. The challan has already been presented and charges stand framed. The petitioner has been wrongly implicated in the commission of alleged offence. The petitioner is not involved in any other FIR. The petitioner is permanent resident of District Mahendergarh and staying with family members. The petitioner has deep roots in the society. There is no possibility of flee from justice.

3. Learned State Counsel submits that police report has already been filed and charges stand framed. There are total 12 witnesses and 06 witnesses including prosecutrix have already been examined. The petitioner is involved in the commission of grave offence, thus, no leniency is warranted and release of petitioner would hamper the trial.

4. A two Judge Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51**, with respect to prevailing conditions of undertrial prisoner in India has observed:

“6. Jails in India are flooded with undertrial prisoners. The statistics placed before us would indicate that more than 2/3rd of the inmates of the prisons constitute undertrial prisoners. Of this category of prisoners, majority may not even be required to be arrested despite registration of a cognizable offence, being charged with offences punishable for seven years or less. They are not only poor and illiterate but also would include women. Thus, there is a culture of offence being inherited by many of them. As observed by this Court, it certainly exhibits the mindset, a vestige of colonial India, on the part of the investigating agency, notwithstanding the fact arrest is a

draconian measure resulting in curtailment of liberty, and thus to be used sparingly. In a democracy, there can never be an impression that it is a police State as both are conceptually opposite to each other.”

5. Intent of arrest and reason of denial of bail is to:
 - i) Secure the appearance of the accused at the time of trial;
 - ii) Allay possibility of repeating of offence & jeopardising own life on account of grim prospect of being convicted;
 - iii) Avoid possibility of tampering of evidence and security of witnesses who may be pressurised or maltreated.
6. A person who seeks to be liberated must take judgment and serve sentence in the event of his conviction. The nature of the crime charged, severity of punishment prescribed, prime facie available evidences, history & background of the accused may indicate that any amount of bond and surety is not going to secure presence of accused, at the time of conviction. Detention or arrest not only deprives a person from his fundamental right of personal liberty guaranteed by Article 21 but also freedom guaranteed by article 19(1) of our Constitution.
7. Keeping in mind:
 - i) The Petitioner is in custody since 21.02.2022;
 - ii) Police report under section 173 of Cr.P.C. stands filed and charges stand framed;
 - iii) There are total 12 witnesses and 06 including prosecutrix have been examined;

- iv) There is no allegation of commission of rape against the petitioner;
- v) There is no possibility of immediate conclusion of trial;
- vi) As prosecution has right to arrest, investigate the matter and restrain an accused from manipulating or winning over witnesses, similarly accused in view of Article 21 of the Constitution of India has right to defend himself and put forth his stand which cannot be possible while in custody;
- vii) Twin stringent conditions of bail prescribed under special statutes like PMLA, UAPA, NDPS Act , Companies Act are not applicable in the case in hand;
- viii) The Petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case;
- ix) The Petitioner is permanent resident of District Mahendergarh and having family members;
- x) Prosecution has not led any convincing/plausible documentary or oral evidence indicating possibility of Petitioner being flee from justice or tempering the evidences or winning over/threatening the witnesses;

this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition deserves to allowed and accordingly allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to conditions as may be imposed by trial Court/Illaq/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

12.01.2023
anju

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No