

Natthu Lal 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:14183

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 33317 of 2024

Applicant :- Natthu Lal

Opposite Party :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Applicant :- Kuldeep Kumar Dixit, Sarve Nazir, Zafar Abbas

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Krishan Pahal, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Zafar Abbas, learned counsel for the applicant as well as Sri Sunil Kumar, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 46 of 2024, U/S 498-A, 304-B IPC and 3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, Police Station Nawabganj, District Bareilly, during the pendency of trial.

PROSECUTION STORY:

4. The marriage of the son of the applicant was solemnized with the daughter of the informant (deceased person) as per Hindu rites on 23.6.2022. The applicant and other family members are stated to have subjected her to cruelty for a demand of a Swift Dzire car as dowry, drawing her to consume certain poisonous material on 29.1.2024. The deceased was admitted to hospital by the

applicant himself and she succumbed to the said poisonous material consumed, the next day i.e. 30.1.2024.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT:

5. The applicant, who is the father-in-law of the deceased person, 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 informant was present at the time of the inquest proceedings, which was concluded on 30.1.2024 at 12.30 pm itself and has not whispered a single word against the applicant or any other person of having demanded dowry, whatsoever. The said allegations of demand of dowry is an after-thought, as the FIR has been instituted after a delay of more than one day of her death. The FIR was instituted on 1.2.2024 at 21.08 hours.

7. The cause of death could not be ascertained, as such, viscera was preserved. The viscera report indicates that organochloro insecticide was found in it.

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 27.4.2024. 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. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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?.

15. Learned AGA could not bring forth any exceptional circumstances which would warrant denial of bail to the applicant.

16. 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 AGA.

17. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, the delay in institution of FIR, the fact that the informant was panch witness no. 1 in the inquest proceedings, 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.

18. Let the applicant- Natthu Lal 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.

19. 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.

20. 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\Shalini (Justice Krishan Pahal)