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. 5435 OF 2025

CRIME NO.12/2025 OF Changaramkulam Police Station, Malappuram

PETITIONER/S:

BABY
AGED 67 YEARS
W/O RAMAKRISHNAN, KURUVATH HOUSE, PUTHENPEEDIKA P.O., VADAKKUMURI VILLAGE, THRISSUR TALUK, THRISSUR, PIN - 680642

BY ADVS.
ANAND KALYANAKRISHNAN
C.DHEERAJ RAJAN
LIBIN VARGHESE

RESPONDENT/S:

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

SRI G SUDHEER, PP

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10.04.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

B.A.No.5435 of 2025

Dated this the 10th day of April, 2025

O R D E R

This Bail Application is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS).

2. Petitioner is an accused in Crime No.12/2025 of Changaramkulam Police Station. The above case is registered alleging offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code and also under Sections 21, 23, 3, 4 & 5 of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 (for short, the BUDS Act).

3. The prosecution case is that; the Pravasi Syndicate Chits Private Limited (Malayali Kshema Nidhi Limited) is operated by accused No.1 and 2. They assured the defacto complainant that, they would provide 12% interest on the deposited amount. Relying on this, the defacto complainant in this case deposited huge amount. However, they did not obtain the principal amount or the

promised interest. Hence, it is alleged that the accused committed the above said offences.

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

5. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that; the petitioner was in custody in connection with the same set of facts and she was released on bail by this Court as per the common order dated 05.03.2025 in BA No.2968/2025 and connected cases. After releasing the petitioner based on the above bail order, now the Police is again harassing the petitioner and attempting to arrest the petitioner. The counsel submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide any conditions if this court grant her on bail.

6. The Public Prosecutor opposed the bail applications.

7. Admittedly the petitioner was in custody for several days in connection with difference crimes with same set of facts. I am of the considered opinion that indefinite incarceration of the petitioner is not necessary. The petitioner can be directed to surrender before the

Investigating Officer within three weeks. After interrogation, if the arrest of the petitioner is recorded, there can be a direction to release the petitioner on bail.

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.

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 three 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 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 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, 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