



Crl. O.P. No.22422 of 2024

Crl. O.P. No.22422 of 2024

P. DHANABAL, J.,

The petitioners who apprehend arrest in the hand of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 448, 427, 307 & 379 of IPC in connection with the Cr. No.239 of 2020, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to the family dispute and pendency of divorce petition, on 02.03.2020, there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant and due to the same, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant and damaged the articles in the defacto complainant's house, as a result of which, the defacto complainant sustained injuries and hence the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are innocent persons, that they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case, that already as per the order passed by this Court in Crl. O.P. No.16364 of 2020 dated 14.10.2020, anticipatory bail was granted on condition that the petitioners have to execute bond within 15 days failing which, the order passed by this Court



shall stands dismissed automatically, that due to covid pandemic, the petitioners were unable to execute the sureties within the stipulated time and therefore, he filed this petition for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent police would contend that already the petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this Court and thereafter, they did not execute sureties within the time and now they have again come forward with this petition seeking anticipatory bail. Therefore, as per the order passed by this Court, the anticipatory bail already granted automatically gets dismissed. Therefore, he prays to dismiss this petition.

5. This Court heard both sides and perused the entire materials available on record.

6. It is an admitted fact that already this Court granted anticipatory bail vide order passed in Crl. O.P. No.16364 of 2024 dated 14.10.2020 by fixing time to execute sureties. In that order, there is a specific direction that the petitioners have to execute sureties and to comply with the conditions, failing which the



order granting anticipatory bail by this Court shall stand automatically dismissed. The petitioners were unable to produce sureties before the concerned Magistrate within the stipulated period. Now they have filed this petition once again to grant anticipatory bail to them.

7. At this juncture, it is relevant to rely the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sushila Aggarwal and others vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another in Special Leave Petition (Criminal) Nos.7281-7282 of 2017, in which, in the final conclusions in para nos.1 to 3 and 12, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:-*

"FINAL CONCLUSIONS:

In view of the concurring judgments of Justice M.R. Shah and of Justice S. Ravindra Bhat with Justice Arun Mishra, Justice Indira Banerjee and Justice Vineet Saran agreeing with them, the following answers to the reference are set out:

(1) Regarding Question No.1, this Court holds that the protection granted to a person under Section 438 Cr.P.C. should not invariably be limited to a fixed period; it should inure in favour of the accused without any restriction on time. Normal conditions under Section 437(3) read with Section 438(2) should be imposed; if there are specific facts or features in regard to any offence, it is open for the Court to impose any appropriate condition (including fixed nature of relief, or its being tied to an event) etc.,

(2) As regards the second question referred to this Court, it is



WEB COPY



Crl. O.P. No.22422 of 2024

held that the life or duration of an anticipatory bail order does not end normally at the time and stage when the accused is summoned by the Court, or when charges are framed, but can continue till the end of the trial. Again, if there are any special or peculiar features necessitating the Court to limit the tenure of anticipatory bail, it is open for it to do so.

1, This Court, in the light of the above discussion in the two judgments, and in the light of the answers to the reference, hereby clarifies that the following need to be kept in mind by Courts, dealing with applications under Section 438 Cr.P.C.

(1) Consistent with the judgment in *Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia and others v. State of Punjab*", when a person complains of apprehension of arrest and approaches for order, the application should be based on concrete facts (and not vague or general allegations) relatable to one or other specific offence. The application seeking anticipatory bail should contain bare essential facts relating to the offence, and why the applicant reasonably apprehends arrest, as well as his side of the story. These are essential for the Court which should consider his application, to evaluate the threat or apprehension, its gravity or seriousness and the appropriateness of any condition that may have to be imposed. It is not essential that an application should be moved only after an FIR is filed; it can be moved earlier, so long as the facts are clear that there is reasonable basis for apprehending arrest.

(2) It may be advisable for the Court, which is approached with an application under Section 438, depending on the seriousness of the threat (of arrest) to issue notice to the public prosecutor and obtain facts, even while granting limited interim anticipatory bail.

(3) Nothing in Section 438 Cr.P.C. compels or obliges Courts to impose conditions limiting relief in terms of time, or upon filing of FIR, or recording of statement of any witness, by the police, during



investigation or inquiry etc., While considering an application (for grant of anticipatory bail) the Court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation, or tampering with evidence (including intimidating witnesses), likelihood of fleeing justice (such as leaving the country), etc., The Courts would be justified - and ought to impose conditions spelt out in Section 437(3) Cr.P.C. [by virtue of Section 438(2)]. The need to impose other restrictive conditions, would have to be judged on a case by case basis, and depending upon the materials produced by the State or the investigating agency. Such special or other restrictive conditions may be imposed if the case or cases warrant, but should not be imposed in a routine manner, in all cases. Likewise, conditions which limit the grant of anticipatory bail may be granted, if they are required in the facts of any case or cases; however, such limiting conditions may not be invariably imposed.

(12) The observations in *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra & Ors (and other similar judgments)* that no restrictive conditions at all can be imposed, while granting anticipatory bail are hereby overruled. Likewise, the decision in *Salauddin Abdulsamad Shaikh v. State of Maharashtra and subsequent decisions (including K.L. Verma v. State & Anr, Sunita Devi v. State of Bihar & Anr, Adri Dharan Das v. State of West Bengal, Nirmal Jeet Kaur v. State of M.P. & Anr., HDFC Bank Limited v. J.J. Mannan; Satpal Singh v. the State of Punjab and Naresh Kumar Yadav v. Ravindra Kumar)* which lay down such restrictive conditions or terms limiting the grant of anticipatory bail, to a period of time are hereby overruled".

8. On a careful perusal of the above said judgments, it is clear that Nothing in



Crl. O.P. No.22422 of 2024

Section 438 Cr.P.C. compels or obliges Courts to impose conditions limiting relief in terms of time and that the protection granted to a person under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. should not invariably be limited to a fixed period and it should inure in favour of the accused without any restriction on time.

9. In the case on hand, already this Court granted anticipatory bail by fixing time to execute sureties on a specific direction that if the petitioners failed to comply with the condition, the order granting anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed automatically. Since, there is no time limit fixed as per law and the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the above mentioned cases held that automatic cancellation is not in accordance with law, this Court, instead of granting anticipatory bail once again, is inclined to extend the time for another **1 month** from the date of receipt of copy of this order to furnish sureties to the petitioners.

10. With the above observations, the Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

12.09.2024

mjs



Crl. O.P. No.22422 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police, Palladam Police Station, Tiruppur District.
2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

P.DHANABAL,J
mjs



WEB COPY



Crl. O.P. No.22422 of 2024

CRL O.P. No.22422 of 2024

12.09.2024