2025:KER:31363

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

THURSDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 20TH CHAITHRA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 5042 OF 2025

CRIME NO.67/2025 OF Thrikkodithanam Police Station, Kottayam

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED IN Bail Appl. NO.2002 OF 2025 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA

PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED NO.2:

THOMAS JOHN
AGED 53 YEARS
S/O T.T JOHN, THUMBOLIL HOUSE, PC KAVALA P.O, PAIPPAD, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT, PIN - 686537

BY ADVS.
GERRY DOUGLES S.
SONAM GERRY

RESPONDENT(S)/COMPLAINANT:

1. **STATE OF KERALA**
   REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF KERALA, PIN - 682031
2. **SHO THRIKODITHANAM PS, KOTTAYAM DIST.**
   REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF KERALA, PIN - 682031

BY ADV.:

SRI HRITHWIK C S, SR.PP

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10.04.2025, ALONG WITH Bail Appl..5052/2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

2025:KER:31363

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

THURSDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 20TH CHAITHRA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 5052 OF 2025

CRIME NO.130/2025 OF Kodakara Police Station, Thrissur

PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED NO.1:

THOMAS JOHN
AGED 53 YEARS
S/O T.T JOHN, THUMBOLIL HOUSE, PC KAVALA P.O,
PAIPPAD, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT, PIN - 686537

BY ADVS.
GERRY DOUGLES S.
SONAM GERRY

RESPONDENT(S)/COMPLAINANT:

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

2 **SHO, KODAKARA PS, THRISSUR RURAL DIST**
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF KERALA, PIN - 682031

BY ADV.:

SRI HRITHWIK C S, SR.PP

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10.04.2025, ALONG WITH Bail Appl..5042/2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

2025:KER:31363

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J.

BA No.5042 and 5052 of 2025

Dated this the 10th day of April, 2025

O R D E R

These Bail Applications are filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023. These two bail applications are connected and therefore, I am disposing of these two cases by a common order.

2. The petitioner in both these cases are one and the same person. He is an accused in Crime No.67/2025 of Thrikkodithanam Police Station, Kottayam and Crime No.130/2025 of Kodakara Police Station, Thrissur. The above crimes are registered against the petitioner

alleging offences punishable *inter alia* under Sections 406 and 420 r/w 34 of IPC.

3. The prosecution case is that the accused cheated the defacto complainants by offering visa and job in U.K., New Zeland and Australia. The visa or the job is not provided and the amount collected is not returned. Hence, it is alleged that the accused committed the offence.

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

5. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 12.02.2025 in connection with Crime No.67/2025 and his arrest is recorded in Crime No.130/2025 on 21.02.2025. The counsel also submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide any condition imposed by this Court, if this Court grant him bail.



6. The Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application. He submitted that the petitioner is involved in several other cases.

7. It is true that the allegation against the petitioner is serious. The petitioner was first arrested on 03.02.2025 in connection with Crime No.897/2024 of Anchal Police Station. Subsequently, the arrest of the petitioner is recorded in these cases on 12.02.2025 and 21.02.2025. Indefinite incarceration of the petitioner is not necessary. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I think, the petitioner can be released on bail after imposing 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 in as much 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. Moreover, in ***Jalaluddin Khan v. Union of India*** *[2024 KHC 6431],* the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that:

> "21. Before we part with the Judgment, we must mention here that the Special Court and the High Court did not consider the material in the charge sheet objectively. Perhaps the focus was more on the activities of PFI, and therefore, the appellant's case could not

be properly appreciated. When a case is made out for a grant of bail, the Courts should not have any hesitation in granting bail. The allegations of the prosecution may be very serious. But, the duty of the Courts is to consider the case for grant of bail in accordance with the law. "Bail is the rule and jail is an exception" is a settled law. Even in a case like the present case where there are stringent conditions for the grant of bail in the relevant statutes, the same rule holds good with only modification that the bail can be granted if the conditions in the statute are satisfied. The rule also means that once a case is made out for the grant of bail, the Court cannot decline to grant bail. If the Courts start denying bail in deserving cases, it will be a violation of the rights guaranteed under Art.21 of our Constitution.” (underline supplied)

10. In ***Manish Sisodia v. Directorate of Enforcement*** [2024 KHC 6426], also the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that:

> “53. The Court further observed that, over a period of time, the trial courts and the High Courts have forgotten a very well - settled principle of law that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. From our experience, we can say that it appears that the trial courts and the High Courts attempt to play safe in matters of grant of bail. The principle that bail is a rule and refusal is an exception is, at times, followed in breach. On account of non - grant of bail even in straight forward open and shut cases, this Court is flooded with huge number of bail petitions thereby adding to the huge pendency. It is high time that the trial courts and the High Courts should recognize the principle that "bail is rule and jail is exception".”

Considering the dictum laid down in the above decisions and considering the facts and circumstances of these cases, these Bail Applications are allowed with the following conditions:



1. *Petitioner shall be released on bail on executing a bond for Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with two solvent sureties each for the like sum to the satisfaction of the jurisdictional Court.*
2. *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.

3. *Petitioner shall not leave India without permission of the jurisdictional Court.*
4. *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.*
5. *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.*



6. If any of the above conditions are violated by the petitioner, the jurisdictional Court can cancel the bail in accordance with law, even though the bail is granted by this Court. The prosecution and the victims are at liberty to approach the jurisdictional court to cancel the bail, if there is any violation of the above condition.

Sd/-
P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN
JUDGE

nvj