

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM  
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

TUESDAY, THE 05TH DAY OF MAY 2020 / 15TH VAISAKHA, 1942

B.A.TMP NO. 216 OF 2020

(CRIME NO.129/2020 OF ADIMALY POLICE STATION, IDUKKI DISTRICT)

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

ANEESH, S/O. THANKAPPAN, AGED 20 YEARS,  
THATTEKANNANKUDY, TRIBAL SETTLEMENT,  
MHACHIPLAVU KARA, MANNAMKANDAM VILLAGE,  
IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI LATHEESH SEBASTIAN

RESPONDENTS/STATE & COMPLAINANT:

1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY  
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM - 682031.
2. STATION HOUSE OFFICER,  
ADIMALY POLICE STATION, IDUKKI - 685561.

BY P.P.SRI.AJITH MURALI & SANTHOSH PETER(SR)

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 05.05.2020,  
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J.**

-----  
**B.A. TMP No. 216 of 2020**  
-----

**Dated this the 5<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2020**

**ORDER**

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

2. The petitioner is the accused in Crime No. 129/2020 of Adimaly Police Station registered alleging offences punishable under Sections 363 & 305 of the IPC. The petitioner was arrested on 15.2.2020 and he is in custody.

3. The prosecution case is that, the daughter of the defacto complainant was residing along with the petitioner from 25.9.2019 to 12.2.2020. It is alleged that, on account of difference between the petitioner

and the daughter of the defacto complainant, the daughter of the defacto complainant committed suicide in the night on 12.2.2020 by hanging. It is alleged that, the suicide of the daughter of the defacto complainant is because of the abetment of the petitioner.

4. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 15.2.2020, and almost 80 days over. According to him, even if the prosecution case is accepted, the offence under Section 305 of the IPC is made out.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application saying that the petitioner committed serious offence. A minor girl who was in custody of the petitioner died because of the harassment from the side of the petitioner.

6. After hearing both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I think bail can be

granted to the petitioner. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody for the last 80 days. Moreover, the investigation of the case is almost over. In addition to that, except under Section 305 of the IPC, no allegation against the petitioner.

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, I think the petitioner can be released on bail. 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**

MMG