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. 5259 OF 2025

CRIME NO.1141/2024 OF Nemom Police Station,

Thiruvananthapuram

PETITIONER/S:

MUHAMMED RAMEEZ
AGED 19 YEARS
S/O SULFICAR, CHALUVILA VEEDU, OLIPPIL, SANTHIVILA MARKET JUNCTION, 5TH WARD, KALLIYOOR VILLAGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 695042

BY ADV LATHEESH SEBASTIAN

RESPONDENT/S:

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

2. **STATION HOUSE OFFICER**
   NEMOM POLICE STATION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 695020

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:

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

B.A.No.5259 of 2025

Dated this the 11th day of April, 2025

O R D E R

This Bail Application is filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS).

2. Petitioner is the accused in Crime No1141/2024 of Nemom Police Station, registered alleging offences punishable under Sections 109, 126(1), 296(a) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023.

3. The prosecution case is that; petitioner and the other accused on 28.07.2024 at about 7.30 P.M, the accused six in numbers, attacked the defacto complainant and his friend by using a sword and caused injuries on the head. It is further alleged that, the when the defacto complainant attempted to ran away from the scene the accused followed the defacto complainant and again attacked him and caused injury on the hand. It is further alleged that when the friend of the defacto complainant

attempted to save the defacto complainant, he also was assaulted and caused injury on the hand and there by committed the offence punishable Sections 109, 126(1), 296(a) and 3(5) of BNS. Petitioner was arrested in connection with another crime on 10.03.2025. Petitioner's arrest in this case was recorded on 27.03.2025.

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

5. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that, the petitioner is the third accused and he is in custody from 10.03.2025 in another case. His arrest in this case was recorded on 27.03.2025. Petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions, if this Court grants him bail.

6. Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application. He also submitted that the petitioner is involved in one more case.

7. This Court considered the contentions of the petitioner and the Public Prosecutor. It is true that the allegations against the petitioner is very serious. But considering the facts and circumstances of the case and

also considering the period of detention, 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 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. 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 decision and considering the facts and circumstances of this case, this Bail Application is allowed with the following directions:

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 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 there is any violation of the above conditions.

Sd/-

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, JUDGE

SSG