

Manoj Kumar vs State Of Up And 3 Others on 4 February, 2025

Author: Krishan Pahal

Bench: Krishan Pahal

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

?Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:15012

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 40168 of 2024

Applicant :- Manoj Kumar

Opposite Party :- State Of Up And 3 Others

Counsel for Applicant :- Piyush Dubey

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Krishan Pahal,J.

1. List has been revised. As informed by learned State Law Officer, notice has been served to the informant on 21.11.2024.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as Sri R.P. Patel, learned State Law Officer and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 0442 of 2020, U/S 363, 366, 376 IPC and 3/4 POCSO Act, Police Station Jagdishpura, District Agra, during the pendency of trial.

PROSECUTION STORY:

4. The applicant is stated to have enticed away the minor daughter of the informant on 26.8.2020. The victim is stated to have taken away cash and ornaments worth Rs. 15 lakhs from her house alongwith her.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT:

5. The applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case with a view to cause unnecessary harassment and to victimize him. He has nothing to do with the said offence.

6. The victim is the consenting party, as she had taken cash and ornaments alongwith her. She was examined as P.W. 2 in Court on 13.8.2024 and she has categorically stated in it that she has taken Rs. 4 lakhs cash and ornaments worth Rs. 10 lakhs alongwith her.

7. The victim was major, aged about 18 years, at the time of the incident. The fundamental rights of the applicant stands violated, as the statement of P.W. 2 was recorded on 13.8.2024 itself, as such, there is no likelihood of conclusion of trial in the near future.

8. 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.

9. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 3.10.2020. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF INFORMANT/STATE:

10. The bail application has been opposed but the fact that there is no criminal history of the applicant has not been disputed.

CONCLUSION:

11. The Supreme Court in the case of Union of India vs. K.A. Najeeb, AIR 2021 SC 712, has observed as under:-

"We are conscious of the fact that the charges levelled against the respondent are grave and a serious threat to societal harmony. Had it been a case at the threshold, we would have outrightly turned down the respondent's prayer. However, keeping in mind the length of the period spent by him in custody and the unlikelihood of the trial being completed anytime soon, the High Court appears to have been left with no other option except to grant bail."

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. Reiterating the aforesaid view the Supreme Court in the case of *Manish Sisodia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement* 2024 INSC 595 has again emphasized 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?.

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

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. Let the applicant- Manoj Kumar 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.

20. 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.

21. 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 :- 4.2.2025 Shalini (Justice Krishan Pahal)