



2025:KER:30036

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

MONDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 17TH CHAITHRA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 4411 OF 2025

CRIME NO.133/2025 OF Kodenchery Police Station, Kozhikode

PETITIONER/S:

MANU P C
AGED 33 YEARS
S/O. CHANDRAN, PARAYIL HOUSE, KODENCHERY, KOZHIKODE
-, PIN - 673580

BY ADVS.
T.D.SUSMITH KUMAR
JAYKAR.K.S.
C.SIVADAS
VANDANA A.
ANJALI R. MENON
ALMY ANIL

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF
KERALA, PIN - 682031
- 2 STATION HOUSE OFFICER
KODENCHERY POLICE STATION, THAMARASSERY,
KOZHIKODE-, PIN - 673580



2025:KER:30036

OTHER PRESENT:

SR PP-HRITHWIK C S

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
07.04.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:



2025:KER:30036

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

B.A. No.4411 of 2025

Dated this the 7th day of April, 2025

O R D E R

This Bail Application is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

2. The petitioner is an accused in Crime No. 133/2025 of Kodenchery Police Station. The above case is registered against the petitioner alleging offences punishable under Secs. 329(4), 126(2) and 115(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) and also Sec.31(1) of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, ('DV Act').

3. The prosecution case is that the petitioner, who is the husband of the defacto complainant violated the orders passed by the Magistrate Court under the DV Act. Hence, it is alleged that the accused committed the offences.



2025:KER:30036

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

5. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that except Sec. 31(1) of the DV Act, all other offences are bailable. The maximum punishment that can be imposed for Sec. 31(1) of the DV Act is only one year. The petitioner is ready to abide any conditions, if this Court grants him bail. The Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application.

6. Admittedly, it is a matrimonial dispute. There is some matrimonial dispute pending between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Except Sec.31(1) of the DV Act, the other offences alleged are all bailable offences. The maximum punishment that can be imposed for the offences under Sec. 31(1) DV Act is only one year. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, I think the petitioner can be released on bail, after imposing stringent conditions.

7. Moreover, it is a well accepted principle that the bail is the rule and the jail is the exception. The Hon'ble



2025:KER:30036

Supreme Court in **Chidambaram. P v Directorate of Enforcement [2019 (16) SCALE 870]**, after considering all the earlier judgments, observed that, the basic jurisprudence relating to bail remains the same inasmuch as the grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception so as to ensure that the accused has the opportunity of securing fair trial.

8. Recently the Apex Court in **Siddharth v State of Uttar Pradesh and Another [2021(5)KHC 353]** considered the point in detail. The relevant paragraph of the above judgment is extracted hereunder.

“12. We may note that personal liberty is an important aspect of our constitutional mandate. The occasion to arrest an accused during investigation arises when custodial investigation becomes necessary or it is a heinous crime or where there is a possibility of influencing the witnesses or accused may abscond. Merely because an arrest can be made because it is lawful does not mandate that arrest must be made. A distinction must be made between the existence of the power to arrest and the justification for exercise of it. (Joginder Kumar v. State of UP and Others (1994 KHC 189: (1994) 4 SCC 260: 1994 (1) KLT 919: 1994 (2) KLJ 97: AIR 1994 SC 1349: 1994 CriLJ 1981)) If arrest is made routine, it can cause incalculable harm to the reputation and self-



2025:KER:30036

esteem of a person. If the Investigating Officer has no reason to believe that the accused will abscond or disobey summons and has, in fact, throughout cooperated with the investigation we fail to appreciate why there should be a compulsion on the officer to arrest the accused.”

9. In **Manish Sisodia v. Central Bureau of Investigation [2023 KHC 6961]**, the Apex Court observed that even if the allegation is one of grave economic offence, it is not a rule that bail should be denied in every case.

10. Considering the dictum laid down in the above decision and considering the facts and circumstances of this case, this Bail Application is allowed with the following directions:

1. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer within two weeks from today and shall undergo interrogation.

2. After interrogation, if the Investigating Officer propose to arrest the



2025:KER:30036

petitioner, he shall be released on bail on executing a bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with two solvent sureties each for the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting officer concerned.

3. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer for interrogation as and when required. The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation and shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

4. Petitioner shall not leave India without permission of the



2025:KER:30036

jurisdictional Court.

5. Petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected.

6. Needless to mention, it would be well within the powers of the investigating officer to investigate the matter and, if necessary, to effect recoveries on the information, if any, given by the petitioner even while the petitioner is on bail as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi) and another*** [2020 (1) KHC 663].

7. The observations and findings in this order is only for the purpose of deciding this bail application. The principle laid down by this Court in ***Anzar***



2025:KER:30036

Azeez v. State of Kerala [2025 SCC

OnLine KER 1260] is applicable in this case also.

8. If any of the above conditions are violated by the petitioner, the jurisdictional Court can cancel the bail in accordance to law, even though the bail is granted by this Court. The prosecution and the victim are at liberty to approach the jurisdictional Court to cancel the bail, if any of the above conditions are violated.

Sd/-**P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN
JUDGE**