2025:KER:31857

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN**

**FRIDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 21ST CHAITHRA, 1947**

**BAIL APPL. NO. 4899 OF 2025**

**CRIME NO.895/2024 OF Rajakkad Police Station, Idukki**

**PETITIONER(S)/2ND ACCUSED:**

**SHAMEELA**
**AGED 33 YEARS**
**W/O. HABEEB, KUTHIBI NAGAR (1-102/5), KINNYA, D.K. DISTRICT, KARNATAKA, PIN - 575023**

**BY ADV SHABU SREEDHARAN**

**RESPONDENT(S)/COMPLAINANT:**

**STATE OF KERALA**
**REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF KERALA, PIN - 682031**

**BY ADV.**
**SRI. NOUSHAD K A, SR.PP**

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 11.04.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

2025:KER:31857

**P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J**

---

B.A.No.4899 of 2025

---

Dated this the 11th day of April, 2025

**O R D E R**

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

2. Petitioner is an accused in Crime No.895/2024 of Rajakkadu Police Station, Idukki. The above case is registered against the petitioner and others alleging offences punishable under Sections 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3. The prosecution case is that, the 1st accused offered the defacto complainant to give employment visa to UK on paying Rs.16 lakhs. Accordingly, the defacto complainant transferred Rs.8 lakhs to the account of the petitioner on 3.11.2023 and another Rs.8 lakhs to the account of the husband of the petitioner on 9.11.2023. Without

2025:KER:31857

arranging such employment and without paying back the said amount, the accused persons cheated him. Hence it is alleged that the accused committed the above said offences.

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

5. Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is the wife of the 3rd accused. The counsel submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence. The counsel submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide any conditions if this Court grants her bail.

6. The Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application and submitted that there are criminal antecedents to the petitioner.

7. This Court considered the contentions of the petitioner and the Public Prosecutor. Admittedly the petitioner is a lady. Petitioner is the 2nd accused. According to the petitioner, she has no financial transaction with the defacto complainant. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I think the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not





necessary. The maximum punishment that can be imposed for the offence alleged is up to 7 years. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I think this bail application can be allowed on stringent conditions.

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

9. 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-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."

10. 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.

11. 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 petitioner, she 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 her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

4. Petitioner shall not leave India without permission of the jurisdictional Court.

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

2025:KER:31857

the jurisdictional Court to cancel the bail, if any of the above conditions are violated.

Sd/-

**P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, JUDGE**

DM