2025:KER:30582

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

TUESDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 18TH CHAITHRA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 5113 OF 2025

CRIME NO.153/2024 OF MAVELIKKARA EXCISE RANGE OFFICE, ALAPPUZHA

PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED:

MINI, AGED 47 YEARS, D/O CHINNAMMA, CHIRATHARA SAJAN VILLA, CHENNITHALA, KIZHAKKU MURI, THRIPPERUMTHARA VILLAGE, MAVELIKARA TALUK, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN - 690105

BY ADV M.J.SANTHOSH

RESPONDENT(S)/COMPLAINANT:

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

BY ADV.
SR PP – SRI. HRITHWIK C S

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 08.04.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

2025:KER:30582

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

B.A.No.5113 of 2025

Dated this the 08th 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.153/2024 of Mavelikara Excise Range Office, Alappuzha. The above case is registered against the petitioner alleging offence punishable under Section 55(i) of the Kerala Abkari Act.

3. The prosecution case is that the accused was found in possession of 2.5 litre of Indian Made Foreign Liquor. 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

2025:KER:30582

petitioner is ready to abide any conditions if this Court grants her bail. Even though the contraband was seized, she was not arrested by the detecting officer. The counsel submitted that the petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation.

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 seized article is 2.5 litre of Indian Made Foreign Liquor which is available in the market. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the petitioner is a lady, 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

2025:KER:30582

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

2025:KER:30582

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

2025:KER:30582

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,

2025:KER:30582

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