2025:KER:31851

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. 4994 OF 2025

CRIME NO.127/2025 OF THEKKUMBHAGOM POLICE STATION, Kollam

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED 22.02.2025 IN CRMC NO.353 OF 2025 OF DISTRICT COURT & SESSIONS COURT,KOLLAM

PETITIONER(S)/4TH ACCUSED:

ANANDHU, AGED 23 YEARS, S/O.VINESH KUMAR,
EZHUTHIL PADINJATTATHIL, ARINALLOOR P.O,
THEVALAKKARA, KOLLAM, PIN - 690538

BY ADVS.
PRATHEESH.P
AMAR PRASANTH G.
ANJANA KANNATH
SAFNA P.S.

RESPONDENT(S)/STATE:

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

2 **STATION HOUSE OFFICER**
CHAVARA THEKKUMBHAGAM POLICE STATION, KOLLAM DISTRICT –, PIN - 691590

2025:KER:31851

BY ADV.

SRI G SUDHEER, PP

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

2025:KER:31851

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

B.A.No.4994 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 the 3rd accused (wrongly mentioned as 4th accused in the statement of facts and the cause title) in Crime No.127/2025 of Chavara Thekkumbhagam Police Station, Kollam. The above case is registered against the petitioner alleging offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 118(1), 115(2), 109, 351(2) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), Sec.27 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Sec.3(a) of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908.

3. The prosecution case is that, on 27.01.2025 at around 03.00 pm., the defacto complainant and his brother were travelling on a scooter and when they reached near Koyivila Kallummoodu junction, accused Nos.1 to 4 intercepted



them and hit the defacto complainant with a stone and threatened him by brandishing a sword. It is further alleged that one of the accused threw some explosive substances aiming at the defacto complainant and created a fearful atmosphere. Due to this act, the defacto complainant and his brother sustained grave injuries in the alleged incident. 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 it is a false case foisted against the petitioner. There is a case and counter case. Annexure-A3 is the FIR in the counter case. The counsel submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide any conditions if this Court grants him 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. Annexures - A1 and A3 are



the case and counter case. There are two versions about the same incident. Which version is correct cannot be decided in a bail application. Moreover, the petitioner is only the 3rd accused. Considering the overt act attributed to the other accused, the overt act attributed to the petitioner is less. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I think this bail application can be allowed on stringent conditions. There can be a direction to the petitioner to appear before the Investigating Officer on all Mondays at 10 am, till the final report is filed.

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, 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 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 he is accused, or suspected, of the commission



of which he is suspected.

6. Petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer on all Mondays at 10 am, till the final report is filed.

7. 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].

8. 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.

2025:KER:31851

9. 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

DM