

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA.

Cr.MP(M) Nos. 764 to 771 and 778 of 2018

Decided on: 2.7.2018

---

**1.Cr.MP(M) No. 764 of 2018**

Devi Chand .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

---

**2.Cr.MP(M) No. 765 of 2018**

Tej Pratap .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

---

**3.Cr.MP(M) No. 766 of 2018**

Pyare Lal .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

---

**4.Cr.MP(M) No. 767 of 2018**

Khem Raj .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

---

**5.Cr.MP(M) No. 768 of 2018**

Devinder Singh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

---

**6.Cr.MP(M) No. 769 of 2018**

Hari Singh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

---

**7.Cr.MP(M) No. 770 of 2018**

Anil Kumar .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

**8.Cr.MP(M) No. 771 of 2018**

Chobe Ram .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

**9.Cr.MP(M) No. 778 of 2018**

Man Sukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh .....Respondent

Coram:

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.**Whether approved for reporting? <sup>1</sup>

<b>For the Petitioner(s)</b>	:	Mr. G.R. Palsra, Advocate.
<b>For the Respondent(s)</b>	:	Mr. S.C. Sharma and Mr. Dinesh Thakur, Additional Advocate Generals with Mr. Amit Kumar Dhumal Deputy Advocate General.

**Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):**

By way of above captioned petitions filed under Section 439

Cr.PC, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner(s) for grant of bail in respect of FIR No. 111/18 dated 12.6.2018, under Sections 506 and 34 of IPC and 3(1) (G) (S) of SC/ST (POA) Act, registered at PS Bhuntar District Kullu, H.P.

---

<sup>1</sup> Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

**2.** Sequel to order dated 18.6.2018, ASI Parkash Chand, P.S. Bhuntar District Kullu, H.P., has come present along with records. Record perused and returned. Mr. Amit Kumar Dhumal, learned Deputy Advocate General, has also placed on record status report prepared on the basis of investigation carried out by the Investigating Agency.

**3.** Mr. Dhumal, on instructions from Investigating Officer, who is present in Court, fairly acknowledges that pursuant to order dated 18.6.2018, passed by this Court, all the bail petitioners have joined the investigation and they are fully cooperating. Mr. Dhumal further states that investigation in the case is complete and nothing is required to be recovered from the bail petitioners and their custodial interrogation is not required. He, on the instructions of Investigating Officer, also states that in case petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail, they may be directed to make themselves available for investigation as well as trial as and when required by the Investigating Agency.

**4.** In view of the aforesaid fair submissions having been made by the learned Deputy Advocate General, this Court sees no reason for custodial interrogation of the bail petitioners and as such, they deserve to be enlarged on bail. Moreover, guilt, if any, of the bail petitioners is yet to be proved in accordance with law and as such, their freedom cannot be

curtailed for an indefinite period, especially when they have joined the investigation and fully cooperated.

5. Needless to say object of the bail is to secure the attendance of the accused in the trial and the proper test to be applied in the solution of the question whether bail should be granted or refused is whether it is probable that the party will appear to take his trial. Otherwise, bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. Otherwise also, normal rule is of bail and not jail. Court has to keep in mind nature of accusations, nature of evidence in support thereof, severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused involved in that crime.

6. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sanjay Chandra versus Central Bureau of Investigation** (2012)<sup>1</sup> Supreme Court Cases 49; held as under:-

*“ The object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of bail. The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment, unless it can be required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The Courts owe more than verbal respect to the principle that punishment begins after conviction, and that every man is deemed to be innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty. Detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. From time to time, necessity demands that some unconvicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial but in such cases, “necessity” is the operative test. In India , it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the Constitution that any person should be punished in respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances. Apart from the question of prevention being the object of refusal of bail, one must not lose sight of the fact that any imprisonment before conviction has a substantial punitive content and it would be improper for any*

*court to refuse bail as a mark of disapproval of former conduct whether the accused has been convicted for it or not or to refuse bail to an unconvicted person for the propose of giving him a taste of imprisonment as a lesson."*

7. Recently, the Hon'ble Apex Court in Criminal Appeal No. 227/2018, **Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr.**, decided on 6.2.2018, has categorically held that a fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. Hon'ble Apex Court further held that while considering prayer for grant of bail, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Hon'ble Apex Court further held that if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimized, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. The relevant paras of the aforesaid judgment are reproduced as under:

*"2. A fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society.*

3. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case.

4. While so introspecting, among the factors that need to be considered is whether the accused was arrested during investigations when that person perhaps has the best opportunity to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. If the investigating officer does not find it necessary to arrest an accused person during investigations, a strong case should be made out for placing that person in judicial custody after a charge sheet is filed. Similarly, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Surely, if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimised, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. It is also necessary for the judge to consider whether the accused is a first-time offender or has been accused of other offences and if so, the nature of such offences and his or her general conduct. The poverty or the deemed indigent status of an accused is also an extremely important factor and even Parliament has taken notice of it by incorporating an Explanation to Section 436 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. An equally soft approach to incarceration has been taken by Parliament by inserting Section 436A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

5. To put it shortly, a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody. There are several reasons for this including maintaining the dignity of an accused person, howsoever poor that person might be, the requirements of Article 21 of the Constitution and the fact that there is enormous overcrowding in prisons, leading to social and other problems as noticed by this Court in *In Re-Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*.

8. Consequently, in view of the above, order dated 18.6.2018 passed by this Court, is made absolute, subject to each of the petitioners' furnishing personal bonds in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, with following conditions:

- a. *They shall make themselves available for the purpose of interrogation, if so required and regularly attend the trial Court on each and every*

*date of hearing and if prevented by any reason to do so, seek exemption from appearance by filing appropriate application;*

- b. They shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence nor hamper the investigation of the case in any manner whatsoever;*
- c. They shall not make any inducement, threat or promises to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or the Police Officer; and*
- d. They shall not leave the territory of India without the prior permission of the Court.*

9. It is clarified that if the petitioners misuse his liberty or violate any of the conditions imposed upon them, the investigating agency shall be free to move this Court for cancellation of the bail.

10. Any observations made hereinabove shall not be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the cases and shall remain confined to the disposal of these applications alone.

The bail petitions stand disposed of accordingly.

Copy **dasti**.

**2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2018**

*manjit*

**(Sandeep Sharma),  
Judge**