

CNR No. DLCT01-008148-2017
SC No.47/2021
FIR No.40/2017
PS Prasad Nagar
U/s 392/394/397/411/34 IPC
State Vs. Rahul @ Michu & Ors.

09/07/2021

File taken up today on bail application u/s. 439 Cr.P.C. of the accused Raju @ Kali for grant of regular bail.

(Proceedings Convened through Video Conferencing)


Present: Sh. Gyan Prakash Ray, Ld. Addl. P.P. for the State (through V.C.)
Sh. Suraj Prakash Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the accused (through V.C.)

Ahlmad is absent.

By way of present order, this Court shall disposed of bail application u/s. 439 Cr.P.C. of the accused Raju @ Kali for grant of regular bail.

Arguments have already been heard on the aforesaid bail application of accused Raju @ Kali. Perused the material available on record.

During the course of arguments on the aforesaid bail application, it was submitted by counsel for the accused Raju @ Kali that the accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and there is no incriminating evidence against the accused and investigation in the present case has already been completed and the accused is no more required for the purpose of further investigation as the charge-sheet has already been filed in the present case. It was further submitted that nothing has been recovered from the possession of the accused or at his instance. It was further submitted that in the present case, all the material prosecution witnesses have already been examined. It was further submitted that accused has not been



09/07/21

convicted in any case and is having clean antecedents. It was further submitted that accused is in J/C since 18/02/2017 and in view of provisions of Section 436-A Cr.P.C. bail be granted to the accused. It was further submitted that accused is the sole bread earner of his family. It was further submitted that bail be granted to accused and accused shall be abide by all terms and conditions imposed by the court.

During the course of arguments, it was submitted by Addl. P.P. for the State that the allegations against the accused are serious in nature and accused can abscond, if the bail is granted to the accused. It was further submitted that earlier bail application of the accused was dismissed vide order dated 20/04/2018 and in the present bail application, no fresh ground has been mentioned by the accused. It was further submitted that in the present case, charge for the offence u/s 392/394/34 IPC has already been framed against the accused Raju @ Kali and offence u/s 394 IPC prescribed maximum imprisonment for life and in view of the same, accused is not entitled for the bail in terms of the provisions of Section 436-A Cr.P.C. It was further submitted that in the present case, trial/prosecution evidence is at final stage and if bail is granted to the accused, he may abscond. It was further submitted that PW-1 and PW-2 have duly identified the accused during the course of their testimony and the complainant has duly identified the accused during TIP proceedings. It was further submitted that there is sufficient incriminating material against the accused and bail application of the accused Raju @ Kali be dismissed.

It was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as **“Virupakshappa Gouda and Anr. Vs. State of Karnataka and Anr.”** {(2017) 5 SCC 406} that :

“15. The court has to keep in mind what has been stated in Chaman Lal v. State of U.P. The requisite factors are: (i) the nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of

A handwritten signature in blue ink, followed by the date '09/07/21' written in blue ink.

conviction and the nature of supporting evidence; (ii) reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant; and (iii) prima facie satisfaction of the court in support of the charge. In **Prasanta Kumar Sarkar v. Ashis Chatterjee**, it has been opined that while exercising the power for grant of bail, the court has to keep in mind certain circumstances and factors. We may usefully reproduce the said passage:

“9....among other circumstances, the factors which are to be borne in mind while considering an application for bail are:


- (i) whether there is any prima facie or reasonable ground to be believe that the accused had committed the offence.
- (ii) nature and gravity of the accusation;
- (iii) severity of the punishment in the event of conviction;
- (iv) danger of the accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail;
- (v) character, behaviour, means, position and standing of the accused;
- (vi) likelihood of the offence being repeated;
- (vii) reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being influenced; and
- (viii) danger, of course, of justice being thwarted by grant of bail.”

16. In **CBI v. V. Vijay Sai Reddy**, the Court had reiterated the principle by observing thus:- “ 34. While granting bail, the court has to keep in mind the nature of accusation, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public/State and other similar considerations. It has also to be kept in mind that for the purpose of granting bail, the legislature has used the words “reasonable grounds for believing” instead of “the evidence” which means the court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy itself as to whether there is a genuine case against the accused and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima facie evidence in support of the charge. It is not expected, at this stage, to have the evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt.”

09/07/21

17. From the aforesaid principles, it is quite clear that an order of bail cannot be granted in an arbitrary or fanciful manner. In this context, we may, with profit, reproduce a passage from *Neeru Yadav v. State of U.P.*, wherein the Court setting aside an order granting bail observed:

"16. The issue that is presented before us is whether this Court can annul the order passed by the High Court and curtail the liberty of the second respondent? We are not oblivious of the fact that the liberty is a priceless treasure for a human being. It is founded on the bedrock of constitutional right and accentuated further on human rights principle. It is basically a natural right. In fact, some regard it as the grammar of life. No one would like to lose his liberty or barter it for all the wealth of the world. People from centuries have fought for liberty, for absence of liberty causes sense of emptiness. The sanctity of liberty is the fulcrum of any civilized society. It is a cardinal value on which the civilisation rests. It cannot be allowed to be paralysed and immobilized. Deprivation of liberty of a person has enormous impact on his mind as well as body. A democratic body polity which is wedded to rule of law, anxiously guards liberty. But, a pregnant and significant one, the liberty of an individual is not absolute. The society by its collective wisdom through process of law can withdraw the liberty that it has sanctioned to an individual when an individual becomes a danger to the collective and to the societal order. Accent on individual liberty cannot be pyramided to that extent which would bring chaos and anarchy to a society. A society expects responsibility and accountability from its members, and it desires that the citizens should obey the law, respecting it as a cherished social norm. No individual can make an attempt to create a concavity in the stem of social stream. It is impermissible. Therefore, when an individual behaves in a disharmonious manner ushering in disorderly things which the society disapproves, the legal consequences are bound to follow. At that stage, the Court has a duty. It cannot abandon its sacrosanct obligation and pass an order at its own whim or caprice. It has to be guided by the established parameters of law."




It was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as
"Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav and Anr."
{2004 Cri. L.J. 1796 (1)} that :

"11. The law in regard to grant or refusal of bail is very well settled. The Court granting bail should exercise its discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. Though at the stage of granting bail a detailed examination of evidence and elaborate documentation of the merit of the case need not be undertaken, there is a need to indicate in such orders reasons for prima facie concluding why bail was being granted particularly where the accused is charged of having committed a serious offence. Any order devoid of such reasons would suffer from non-application of mind. It is also necessary for the Court granting bail to consider among other circumstances, the following factors also before granting bail; they are,
(a) The nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence;
(b) Reasonable apprehension of tampering of the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant;
(c) Prima facie satisfaction of the Court in support of the charge.

12. In regard to cases where earlier bail applications have been rejected there is a further onus on the Court to consider the subsequent application for grant of bail by noticing the grounds on which earlier bail applications have been rejected and after such consideration if the Court is of the opinion that bail has to be granted then the said Court will have to give specific reasons why in spite of such earlier rejection the subsequent application for bail should be granted.

14. In such cases, in our opinion, the mere fact that the accused has undergone certain period of incarceration (three years in this case) by itself would not entitle the accused to being enlarged on bail, nor the fact that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future either by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration would be sufficient for enlarging the appellant on bail when the gravity of the offence alleged is severe and there are allegations of tampering with the witnesses by the accused during the period he was on bail.


10/10/21

20. Before concluding, we must note though an accused has a right to make successive applications for grant of bail the Court entertaining such subsequent bail applications has a duty to consider the reasons and grounds on which the earlier bail applications were rejected. In such cases, the Court also has a duty to record what are the fresh grounds which persuade it to take a view different from the one taken in the earlier applications.....”

It was held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as **“Satish Jaggi Vs. State of Chhatisgarh and Ors.”** {AIR 2007 SC (Supp) 256} that :

“5. It is well settled law that in granting or non-granting of bail in non-bailable offence, the primary consideration is the nature and gravity of the offence.....

12.At the stage of granting of bail, the court can only go into the question of the prima-facie case established for granting bail. It cannot go into the question of credibility and reliability of the witnesses put up by the prosecution. The question of credibility and reliability of prosecution witnesses can only be tested during the trial.”

It was held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as **“Gurucharan Singh & Others Vs. State”** {AIR 1978 SC 179 (1)} that :

“29. We may repeat the two paramount considerations, viz likelihood of the accused fleeing from justice and his tampering with prosecution evidence relate to ensuring a fair trial of the case in a court of justice. It is essential that due and proper weight should be bestowed on these two factors apart from others. There cannot be an inexorable formula in the matter of granting bail. The facts and circumstances of each case will govern the exercise of judicial discretion in granting or cancelling bail.”

It is pertinent to mention here that the regular bail application of the accused Raju @ Kali was dismissed vide order dated 20/04/2018. Bail applications

[Handwritten signature and date]
20/04/2018


of the accused were dismissed as withdrawn on 04/01/2018 and 05/01/2019. The factum regarding dismissal of the bail application on 20/04/2018 and withdrawal of the bail applications on 04/01/2018 and 05/01/2019 has not been mentioned by the accused in the present bail application. No reasonable explanation has been furnished by counsel for the accused for the same.

Accused is stated to be in J/C since 23/02/2017. In the present case, charge for the offence u/s 392/394/34 IPC has already been framed against the accused Raju @ Kali and offence u/s 394 IPC prescribed maximum imprisonment for life and in view of the period of custody of the accused, accused is not entitled for the bail in terms of the provisions of Section 436-A Cr.P.C. Counsel for the accused in support of his contentions has relied upon case titled as "*Maksud Sheikh Gaffur Sheikh Vs. State of Maharashtra* (Crl. Application No. 270/2020 decided on 28/08/2020 by Hon'ble Nagpur Bench)." Aforesaid case law relied upon by counsel for the accused is not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case.

In the present case, trial/ prosecution evidence is at final stage and if bail is granted to the accused, there is possibility that he may abscond. Accused is stated to be habitual offender and he is stated to be involved in eight cases.

The contentions of counsel for the accused Raju @ Kali that the accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and there is no incriminating evidence against him is not tenable at this stage as it is well settled law that at the stage of considering bail, it would not be proper for the Court to express any opinion on the merits or demerits of the prosecution case as well as defence.


Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of offence and nature of serious allegations levelled against the accused, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground for regular bail of the accused Raju @



09/07/21

Kali is made out. Accordingly, the present application for regular bail of the accused Raju @ Kali is dismissed.

A copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent through e-mail for information. Order be uploaded on the website of the Delhi District Court. Counsel for the accused is at liberty to collect the copy of present order through electronic mode.


(Vijay Shankar)
ASJ-05, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
09/07/2021(A)