

Sumesh M.V vs State of Kerala

Sumesh M.V vs State of Kerala

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1281021

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Apr-11-2025

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice P.V.Kunhikrishnan

Appeal No. : Bail Appl./5004/2025

Appellant : Sumesh M.V

Respondent : State of Kerala

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN
FRIDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 21ST CHAITHRA, 1947
BAIL APPL. NO. 5004 OF 2025 CRIME NO.329/2025 OF
Changaramkulam Police Station, Malappuram

PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED: SUMESH M.V AGED 47 YEARS S/O.
VIJAYAN, MARATH HOUSE, KANHIYOOR, NANNAMUKKU,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 679574 BY ADVS. RASSAL
JANARDHANAN A. P.R.AJAY THAREEQ ANVER K. K.U.SWAPNIL
ABHISHEK M. KUNNATHU RESPONDENT/S: 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF

KERALA, PIN - 682031 2 INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CHANGARAMKULAM POLICE STATION, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT,
PIN - 679585 BY ADV.: SRI G SUDHEER,PP THIS BAIL APPLICATION
HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 11.04.2025, THE COURT ON
THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J.

----- Dated
this the 11th day of April, 2025

ORDER

This bail application is filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

2. Petitioner is the accused in Crime No.329/2025 of Changaramkulam Police Station,

Malappuram. The above case is registered against the petitioner alleging offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 296 and 74 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023.

3. The prosecution case is that, on March 16, 2025, at approximately 4:30 p.m., the defacto

complainant, along with her husband, sister, and two children, was traveling in their car near Jass Bar, Changaramkulam. At that time, the accused, an identifiable individual, was riding a motorcycle while using his mobile phone. Due to the manner in which the accused was riding, the complainant's husband was unable to overtake the bike. In response, he repeatedly honked the horn, prompting the accused to eventually make way, allowing the complainant's husband to overtake the bike. It is also alleged that the accused forcibly pull the complainants husband out of the car and slapped him across the face and

abused them using filthy language. Hence, it is alleged that the accused committed the offence.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

5. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the only non-bailable offence alleged against the petitioner is under Section 74 of BNS. Counsel submitted that, even if the entire allegations are accepted, the ingredients of Section 74 of BNS is not attracted. The counsel also submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide any condition imposed by this Court, if this Court grants him bail.

6. The Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application. He submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is serious. He also submitted that the petitioner has got criminal antecedents.

7. This Court considered the contentions of the petitioner and the Public Prosecutor. The only non-bailable offence alleged against the petitioner is

under Section 74 of the BNS. The maximum punishment that can be imposed for the said offence is below 7 years. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I think, the petitioner can be released on bail after imposing stringent conditions. There can be a direction to the petitioner to appear before the Investigating Officer on all Mondays at 10.00 AM, till final report is filed.

8. Moreover, it is a well accepted principle

that the bail is the rule and the jail is the exception. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Chidambaram. P v Directorate of Enforcement* [2019 (16) SCALE 870], after considering all the earlier judgments, observed that, the basic jurisprudence relating to bail remains the same inasmuch as the grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception so as to ensure that the accused has the opportunity of securing fair trial.

9. Recently the Apex Court in *Siddharth v State of Uttar Pradesh and Another* [2021(5)KHC 353] considered the point in detail. The relevant paragraph of the

above judgment is extracted hereunder.

12. We may note that personal liberty is an important aspect of our constitutional mandate. The occasion to arrest an accused during investigation arises when custodial investigation becomes necessary or it is a heinous crime or where there is a possibility of influencing the witnesses or accused may abscond. Merely because an arrest can be made because it is lawful does not mandate that arrest must be made. A distinction must be made between the existence of the power to arrest and the justification for exercise of it. (Joginder Kumar v. State of UP and Others (1994 KHC 189: (1994) 4 SCC 260: 1994 (1) KLT 919: 1994 (2) KLJ 97: AIR 1994 SC 1349: 1994 Cri LJ 1981)) If arrest is made routine, it can cause incalculable harm to the reputation and self-esteem of a person. If the Investigating Officer has no reason to believe that the accused will abscond or disobey summons and has, in fact, throughout cooperated with the investigation we fail to appreciate why there should be a compulsion on the officer to arrest the accused.

10. In Manish Sisodia v. Central Bureau of Investigation [2023 KHC 6961], the Apex Court observed that, even if the allegation is one of grave economic offence, it is not a rule that bail should be denied in every case. Considering the dictum laid down in the above decisions and considering the facts and circumstances of this case, this Bail Application is allowed with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer within two weeks from today and shall undergo interrogation.

2. After interrogation, if the Investigating

Officer propose to arrest the petitioner, he shall be released on bail on executing a bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with two solvent sureties each for the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting officer concerned.

3. The petitioner shall appear before the

Investigating Officer for interrogation as and when required. The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation and shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

4. Petitioner shall not leave India without permission of the jurisdictional Court.
5. Petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected.
6. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer on all Mondays at 10.00 AM, till final report is filed.
7. The observations and findings in this

order is only for the purpose of deciding

this bail application. The principle laid down by this Court in Anzar Azeez v. State of Kerala [2025 SCC OnLine KER 1260] is applicable in this case also.

8. Needless to mention, it would be well

within the powers of the investigating officer to investigate the matter and, if necessary, to effect recoveries on the information, if any, given by the petitioner even while the petitioner is on bail as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi) and another [2020 (1) KHC 663].

9. If any of the above conditions are violated by the petitioner, the

jurisdictional court can cancel the bail in accordance to law, even though this bail is granted by this Court. The prosecution and the victim are at liberty to approach the jurisdictional court to cancel the bail, if any of the above conditions are violated. Sd/- P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN nvj JUDGE