

Durgawati Devi @ Heerawati 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:14145

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 3008 of 2025

Applicant :- Durgawati Devi @ Heerawati

Opposite Party :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Applicant :- Ali Hasan,Asif Hasan

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Krishan Pahal,J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Ali Hasan, learned counsel for the applicant as well as Sri Anit Kumar Shukla, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.134 of 2024, under Sections 85, 80(2) B.N.S. and 3/4 D.P. Act, Police Station Rampur, District Jaunpur, during the pendency of trial.

PROSECUTION STORY:

4. The marriage of the son of the applicant was solemnized with the deceased person as per Hindu Rites on 24.04.2022. Despite several other gifts, a Hero Splendor motorcycle was also given as

dowry, but the applicant and other family members are stated to have subjected her to cruelty for demand of a bullet motorcycle instead of the said Hero Splendor motorcycle, thereby administered her some poisonous material on 25.07.2024 at about 3:00 p.m.

5. The son of the applicant is stated to have narrated the said incident to the informant the same day and the deceased succumbed to the said poisonous material on 27.07.2024.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

6. The applicant is the mother-in-law of the deceased person and has been falsely implicated in the present case.

7. The FIR is delayed by about two days and there is no explanation of the said delay caused. As far as the death is concerned, the death had occurred in the morning and the inquest proceedings were complete by 2:20 p.m. and the FIR has been instituted at 6:20 p.m., as such, it is delayed by four hours to the inquest proceedings.

8. The informant himself was present as panch witness no.1 in the inquest proceedings and has not whispered a single word of demand of dowry at the said stage.

9. The instant FIR is just an afterthought.

10. The viscera was preserved as the cause of death could not be ascertained and subsequently aluminum phosphide was found in her viscera.

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

12. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 31.10.2024. She is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, she will not misuse the liberty of bail.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF STATE/OPPOSITE PARTY:

13. The bail application has been opposed but the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant could not be disputed.

CONCLUSION:

14. The Supreme Court in the case of Niranjana Singh and another vs. Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote and Others, AIR 1980 SC 785 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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?.

18. Learned A.G.A. could not bring forth any exceptional circumstances which would warrant denial of bail to the applicant.

19. 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 A.G.A.

20. 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.

21. Let the applicant- Durgawati Devi @ Heerawati 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. 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 her in accordance with law.

22. 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.

23. 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 (Ravi Kant) (Justice Krishan Pahal)