

Chandrasen Yadav vs State Of U.P. on 31 January, 2025

Author: Krishan Pahal

Bench: Krishan Pahal

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

?Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:14378

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 2458 of 2025

Applicant :- Chandrasen Yadav

Opposite Party :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Applicant :- Alok Ranjan Mishra, Sr. Advocate

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Krishan Pahal, J.

1. List has been revised.

2. Heard Sri G.S. Chaturvedi, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri Alok Ranjan Mishra,, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Jai Kishan Chaurasiya, learned State Law Officer and perused the record.

3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 123 of 2024, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 352, 103(1), 109(1), 61(2)(a) of B.N.S., Police Station Bahariya, District Prayagraj, during the pendency of trial.

PROSECUTION STORY:

4. The applicant along with co-accused persons is stated to have formed an unlawful assembly and fired at the informant and other persons and it has been categorically mentioned in the FIR that the dispute arose with Surendra Yadav and Abhishek Yadav who had fired from his rifle at Mulayam Yadav causing his death and Gajraj Yadav is stated to have fired at Jitendra causing gun shot wound to his thigh and the applicant is stated to have been carrying hockey at that time. The incident is of 30.07.2024 at about 2:15 p.m. ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT :

5. The applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the said offence.

6. The FIR is delayed by about 12 hours and there is no explanation of the said delay caused.

7. The role of the applicant is general in nature in the FIR and he has not been assigned the role of carrying firearm in it, rather, he has been shown to be carrying a hockey.

8. The particular role has been assigned to Abhishek and Gajraj of having fired at the deceased and injured person respectively.

9. The perusal of CCTV footage of the place of incident categorically falsifies the allegations made in the FIR, rather it shows that the side of the deceased person were the aggressor and they were involved in brick batting and firing on the side of the applicant.

10. The applicant and other family members are stated to have fired causing death of one person and injury to one another person in retaliation.

11. There is a cross version to the instant case as FIR No.125 of 2024 under sections 61(2)(a), 324(4), 109(1), 352, 115(2), 190, 191(3), 191(2) B.N.S. from the side of the applicant.

12. At this point of time, it is well established that the party from the side of the deceased person and the injured person was the aggressor, as such, the applicant is entitled for bail.

13. Several other submissions have been made on behalf of the applicant to demonstrate the falsity of the allegations made against him. The circumstances which, as per counsel, led to the false implication of the applicant have also been touched upon at length.

14. The criminal history assigned to the applicant stands explained. The applicant is languishing in jail since 08.08.2024. The applicant is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF STATE :

15. The bail application has been opposed on the ground that the applicant was shown firing at the deceased person in the statement of the injured person, as such, he is not entitled for bail.

CONCLUSION:

16. In light of the judgement of the Supreme Court passed in Niranjana Singh and another vs Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote and others AIR 1980 SC 785, this Court has avoided detailed examination of the evidence and elaborate documentation of the merits of the case as no party should have the impression that his case has been prejudiced. A prima facie satisfaction of case is needed but it is not the same as an exhaustive exploration of the merits in the order itself.

17. In the case of Prabhakar Tewari Vs. State of U.P. and another, (2020) 11 SCC 648, the Supreme Court has observed that pendency of several criminal cases against an accused by itself cannot be a basis for refusal of bail.

18. The well-known principle of "Presumption of Innocence Unless Proven Guilty," gives rise to the concept of bail as a rule and imprisonment as an exception.

19. A person's right to life and liberty, guaranteed by Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, cannot be taken away simply because the person is accused of committing an offence until the guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt. Article 21 of the Indian Constitution states that no one's life or personal liberty may be taken away unless the procedure established by law is followed, and the procedure must be just and reasonable. The said principle has been recapitulated by the Supreme Court in Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Ors., 2022 INSC 690.

20. Reiterating the aforesaid view the Supreme Court in the case of Manish Sisodia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement 2024 INSC 595 has again emphasised that the very well-settled principle of law that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment is not to be forgotten. It is high time that the Courts should recognize the principle that "bail is a rule and jail is an exception".

21. Learned State Law Officer could not bring forth any exceptional circumstances which would warrant denial of bail to the applicant.

22. It is settled principle of law that the object of bail is to secure the attendance of the accused at the trial. No material particulars or circumstances suggestive of the applicant fleeing from justice or thwarting the course of justice or creating other troubles in the shape of repeating offences or intimidating witnesses and the like have been shown by learned State Law Officer.

23. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. The bail application is allowed.

24. Let the applicant-Chandrasen Yadav involved in aforementioned case crime number be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to following conditions.

(i) The applicant shall not tamper with evidence.

(ii) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the Trial Court on dates fixed for (1) opening of the case, (2) framing of charge and (3) recording of statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C./351 B.N.S.S. If in the opinion of the Trial Court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the Trial Court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

25. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a ground for cancellation of bail. Identity, status and residence proof of the applicant and sureties be verified by the court concerned before the bonds are accepted.

26. It is made clear that observations made in granting bail to the applicant shall not in any way affect the learned trial Judge in forming his independent opinion based on the testimony of the witnesses.

Order Date :- 31.1.2025 Sumit S (Justice Krishan Pahal)