



2025:KER:30833

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 19TH CHAITHRA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 4996 OF 2025

CRIME NO.485/2025 OF Vaikom Police Station, Kottayam

PETITIONER/S:

H I ROHAN
AGED 28 YEARS
UNNIYIL HOUSE, VAIKOM P O, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT, PIN
- 686141

BY ADVS.
P.A.MUJEEB
RESHMA R.

RESPONDENT/S:

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

PP-G SUDHEER

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
09.04.2025, ALONG WITH Bail Appl..4998/2025, THE COURT ON THE
SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2025:KER:30833

BAIL APPL. NOS.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 19TH CHAITHRA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 4998 OF 2025

CRIME NO.485/2025 OF Vaikom Police Station, Kottayam

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 ANEESH P
AGED 42 YEARS
KAVUMMEL HOUSE, PALLIPURATHUSSERY P O VAIKOM,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT, PIN - 686606**
- 2 PRAMOD P
AGED 27 YEARS
S/O PANKAJAKSHAN PULICKAKATH HOUSE, VAIKOM P O,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT, PIN - 686141**

BY ADV P.A.MUJEEB

RESPONDENT/S:

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

SR PP-NOUSHAD K A

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
09.04.2025, ALONG WITH Bail Appl..4996/2025, THE COURT ON THE
SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**



2025:KER:30833

BAIL APPL. NOS.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

3

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

B.A Nos.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

Dated this the 09th day of April, 2025

C O M M O N O R D E R

These Bail Applications are filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS). These Bail Applications are connected and therefore, I am disposing of these cases by a common order.

2. Petitioners are the accused in Crime No. 485/2025 of Vaikom Police Station, registered against the petitioners alleging offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 118(2), 118(1) and 115(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023.

3. The prosecution case is that; on 17.03.2025 at 08:00 pm., the accused persons formed themselves into an unlawful assembly and attacked the defacto complainant with a pipe, helmet etc. It is alleged that the defacto complaint sustained serious injuries.

4. Heard.



2025:KER:30833

BAIL APPL. NOS.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

4

5. Admittedly, there is case and counter case. The accused in in Crime No.485/2025 of Vaikom Police Station is the victim in Crime No.484/2025 of Vaikom Police Station, which is registered first. There are two version about the same incident. Which version is correct cannot be decided while considering a bail application. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I think, the petitioners can be released on bail after imposing stringent conditions.

6. 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 has⁷. 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



2025:KER:30833

BAIL APPL. NOS.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

5

this case also. the opportunity of securing fair trial.

7. 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.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. comes 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.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. (Joginder Kumar v. State of UP and Others (1994 KHC 189: (1994) 4 SCC 260: 1994 (1)



2025:KER:30833

BAIL APPL. NOS.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

6

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.”

8. 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.

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 petitioners 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 petitioners, they shall be released on bail on executing



2025:KER:30833

BAIL APPL. NOS.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

7

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 petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer for interrogation as and when required. The petitioners 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. Petitioners shall not leave India without permission of the jurisdictional Court.

5. Petitioners shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which they are



accused, or suspected, of the commission of which they are 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 petitioners even while the petitioners are 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 petitioners, the jurisdictional



2025:KER:30833

BAIL APPL. NOS.4996 & 4998 OF 2025

9

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

SSG