

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

TUESDAY, THE 12TH DAY OF MAY 2020 / 22ND VAISAKHA, 1942

BA NO.2259 OF 2020

( Crime No. 31 /2020 of Kannur Town Police Station )

**PETITIONER / ACCUSED**

Lajith @ Doodu,  
S/o Sreejith, aged 23 years,  
N.G.O. Quarters, Near Sub Jail,  
Kannur-670001.

BY ADV.SRI.K.RAJESH SUKUMARAN

**RESPONDENTS / STATE**

1. State of Kerala, rep. by Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Kerala, Ernakulam-682031.
2. Station House Officer,  
Kannur Town Police Station, Kannur- 670001.

By P.P. Sri.Ajith Murali & Santhosh Peter(Sr)

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 12.05.2020,  
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

## **ORDER**

This Bail Application filed under Section 439 of Criminal Procedure Code was heard through Video Conference.

2. The petitioner is the sole accused in Crime No.31 of 2020 of Kannur Town Police Station registered alleging offences punishable under Sections 448, 341, 326, 506(ii) and 307 of the Indian Penal Code. The petitioner was arrested on 12.01.2020 and he is in custody.

3. The prosecution case is that on 05.01.2020 at about 7.50 p.m., while the de facto complainant was closing the door of the vazhipadu counter of Kanathoor Mahavishnu temple, the petitioner came with a knife and stabbed him on his left thigh and when the de facto complainant tried to run away, the petitioner followed him and tried to strike him with a knife stating that he will kill him and thereby the petitioner attempted to commit murder the de facto complainant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is in custody from 12.01.2020 onwards. He also

submitted that the de facto complainant is an accused in case punishable under Section 307 IPC in which the petitioner is a witness. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the case was committed to the Sessions Court.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner is in custody from 12.01.2020 onwards and if this Court is granting bail to the petitioner, the same may be on stringent conditions imposed on the petitioner.

6. After hearing both sides and considering the fact that final report has already been filed in this case and the petitioner is in custody from 12.01.2020 onwards and according to the petitioner, he is a witness to a case registered against the de facto complainant and since there is case of false implication to the petitioner, I think, this Bail Application can be granted. Hence, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Bail Application is allowed.

7. Moreover, considering the need to follow social distancing norms inside prisons so as to avert the spread of the novel Corona Virus Pandemic, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

**Re: Contagion of COVID-19 Virus In Prisons case (Suo Motu Writ Petition(C) No.1 of 2020)** and a Full Bench of this Court in **Writ Petition(C) No.9400 of 2020** issued various salutary directions for minimizing the number of inmates inside prisons.

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. Considering the dictum laid down in the above decision and considering the facts and circumstances of this case, this Bail Application is allowed with the following directions:

1. The Superintendent of Jail concerned where the petitioner is incarcerated is directed

to release the petitioner on bail on executing a self bond ensuring that he will appear before the Court concerned as and when required if he is not in detention in any other case. It is further directed that the Superintendent of Jail should get the bail bond from the petitioner as stipulated in Section 441 Cr.P.C.

2. The Superintendent of Jail concerned shall also get the phone number and the address at which the petitioner would be residing after his release.

3. The Superintendent of Jail concerned, immediately after release of the petitioner will forthwith forward the bail bond obtained from the petitioner to the jurisdictional Court.

4. The petitioner immediately after release from the prison, report before the Station House Officer of the Jurisdictional Police Station and shall furnish his phone

number and the place where he is going to reside. The Station House Officer concerned shall keep a vigil on the whereabouts of the petitioner and shall ensure that the petitioner does not violate the terms of the undertaking.

5. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required. The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation and shall not threaten or attempt to influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence.

6. The petitioner shall within one week from the commencement of the functioning of the jurisdictional court, if the court is not functioning at present, execute a bond for Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with two solvent sureties each for the like sum to the satisfaction of the jurisdictional Court.

7. The petitioner shall strictly abide by the

various guidelines issued by the State Government and Central Government with respect to keeping of social distancing and other directions in the wake of declared lock-down.

8. If any of the above conditions are violated by the petitioner, the jurisdictional Court can cancel the bail in accordance with law, even though the bail is granted by this Court.

**P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, JUDGE**

**pkk**