

Vimal Kumar vs State Of U.P. on 2 January, 2025

Author: Krishan Pahal

Bench: Krishan Pahal

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

?Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:16

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 45950 of 2024

Applicant :- Vimal Kumar

Opposite Party :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Applicant :- Atul Pandey

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Krishan Pahal,J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Atul Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri R.P. Singh, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.124 of 2024, under Sections 85, 80(2), 115(2) B.N.S. and 3/4 D.P. Act, Police Station Ghungchai, District Pilibhit, during the pendency of trial.

PROSECUTION STORY:

4. The marriage of the sister of the informant was solemnized with the applicant as per Hindu Rites about four years before her death and the applicant and other family members used to subject her to cruelty for demand of a motorcycle and Rs.2 lakhs as dowry.

5. The applicant and other family members are stated to have sprinkled diesel over her and set her afire on 20.07.2024 at about 4:00 p.m. She was admitted at hospital and she succumbed to the said burn injuries sustained subsequently.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

6. The applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case.

7. The allegations are per se false. There is no immediate demand of dowry before her death.

8. The dying declaration does not mention that the applicant had subjected her to cruelty and had sprinkled the said diesel over the deceased. The deceased in her dying declaration has categorically stated that her mother-in-law used to beat her up and the applicant sided towards his parents and not her and she had herself set her afire by sprinkling diesel.

9. It is a clear-cut case of suicide and does not fall within the category of dowry death.

10. 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.

11. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 20.08.2024 and 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/INFORMANT:

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

CONCLUSION:

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 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".

16. ?LearnedState 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 learnedState 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-Vimal 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 :- 2.1.2025 Ravi/-

(Justice Krishan Pahal)