

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2020

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOHN MICHAEL CUNHA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.776 OF 2020

C/W

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.778 OF 2020

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.860 OF 2020

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.957 OF 2020

IN CRL.P.776 OF 2020

BETWEEN

- 1 . ASHIK @ MOHAMMAD ASIK
S/O FAROOQ
AGED ABOUT 21 YEARS,
R/AT DOOR NO.16-4108-14
ASHTQ MANZIL, MASJID ROAD
SHIRVA, UDUPI TALUK AND DISTRICT
PIN-574575
- 2 . MOHAMMED SUHAL
S/O MAQBUL AHMED
AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS,
R/AT DOOR NO.MJM 1100
KASABA BENGRE
MANGALURU TALUK-575001
- 3 . NASEERUDDIN
S/O K MOHAMMED
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
R/AT NO.10113
DEVINAGAR
KUNJATHBAIL, KAVOOR
MANGALURU TALUK-575001

4 . MOHAMMED SHAKEER
S/O MOHAMMED NAZEER
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
R/AT BANDRIYA NAGAR
KONCHAR, PEJAVARA POST
MANGALURU TLAUK
D K DISTRICT-575001

5 . KALANDAR BASHA
S/O IBRAHIM
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
R/AT KALANDAR BASHA MANZIL,
SHANTHI NAGAR, KAVOOR
MANGALURU TALUK
D K DISTRICT-575001

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI: LETHIF.B., ADVOCATE)

AND

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY MANGALURU NORTH POLICE STATION
D K DISTRICT
REP BY SPP
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU-560001

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI:V.M. SHEELAVANT, SPP-I A/W
SRI: THEJESH.P., HCGP)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED U/S 439 CR.PC PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON BAIL IN CR.NO.133/2019 OF MANGALORE NORTH P.S., D.K., MANGALURU FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 143, 147, 148, 188, 353, 332, 324, 427, 307, 120-B, 149 OF IPC AND SEC.2A AND 2B OF KARNATAKA PREVENTION OF DESTRUCTION AND LOSS OF PROPERTY ACT 1981 AND SEC.174 OF CR.P.C.

IN CRL.P.778 OF 2020

BETWEEN

- 1 . MOHAMMAD AZAR
S/O IBRAHIM
AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS
R/AT K.G.N. HOUSE
NEAR MANJANADY JUNCTION
MANJESHWARA ROAD, MANJANADY
MANGALURU TALUK - 575 201
- 2 . ABDUL AFEEZ
S/O M A MASOOD
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
R/AT JAISOL MANZIL
VIDYANAGAR, KULLOOR
PANJIMOGARU
MANGALURU TALUK - 575 201
- 3 . HARZAN
S/O ABOOBAKKAR
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
R/AT 16/54 PALLAMAJALU HOUSE
MONDANKAPU, B.MOODA VILLAGE,
BANTWAL TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 574 222
- 4 . MOHAMMED NAZEEM
S/O ABDUL SHARIF
AGED ABOUT 24 YEARS,
R/AT 2-78, SUJEER, MARIPALLA
PADU, BANTWALA TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 574 222
- 5 . ANWAR HUSSAIN
S/O MOHAMMED
AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS,
R/AT KODIMAR HOUSE KALAWAR, BAJPE
MANGALURU TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 575 231
- 6 . MOHAMMED IQBAL
S/O ABDUL KHADAR
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,

R/AT 2-93, KEMPU GUDDE KANNURU, ADYAR,
MANGALURU TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 575 231

- 7 . KAISAL @ MOHAMMED KAISAL
S/O ABDUL MUNAF
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,
R/AT ASMA MANZIL C.P.C. COMPOUND KUDROLI
MANGALURU TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 575 231
- 8 . JAVED AKTHAR @ BAAS JAVED
S/O IBRAHIM
AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS,
R/AT C.P.C. COMPOUND, KUDROLI
MANGALURU TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 575 231
- 9 . MOHAMMED JIYAD
S/O ABBAS
AGED ABOUT 19 YEARS
R/AT FIT NO. 303, URDU SCHOOL
HAIDERALI ROAD, KARBALA KUDROLI,
MANGALURU TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 575 231
- 10 . FAYAZ @ MOHAMMED FAYAZ
S/O ADAM BAWA
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
R/AT BANDHARI PAVILION APARTMENT,
4TH FLOOR, FLAT NO. 402
KAVOOR, BADRIYA, JUMMA MASJID
MANGALURU TALUK
D.K.DISTRICT - 575 231

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI: LETHIF B, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY MANGALURU NORTH POLICE STATION
D.K.DISTRICT

REP. BY SPP
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU - 560 001

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI:V.M. SHEELAVANT, SPP-I A/W
SRI: THEJESH.P., HCGP)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED U/S 439 CR.PC PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON BAIL IN CR.NC.133/2019 OF MANGALORE NORTH P.S., D.K., MANGALURU FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 143, 147, 148, 188, 353, 332, 324, 427, 307, 120-B, R/W 149 OF IPC AND SEC.2A AND 2B OF KARNATAKA PREVENTION OF DESTRUCTION AND LOSS OF PROPERTY ACT 1981 AND SEC.174 OF CR.P.C

IN CRL.P.860 OF 2020

BETWEEN

1. ABDUL JALEEL
S/O IBRAHIM
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
R/AT 8-14-1206/1
C P C COMPOUND
KUDROLI
MANGALURU TALUK-575201
D K DISTRICT
- 2 . SAYED ALI RAHISH
S/O ANWAR
AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS,
R/AT 3-10-754-A- A-1 FLAT
NEAR MOHAMADIN MASEEDI
KASABA BAZAR, KUDROLI
MANGALURU TALUK-57501
D K DISTRICT
- 3 . MOHAMMED FAROOK
S/O S IBRAHIM
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
R/AT 2-38/18
BORUGUDDE HOUSE KANNUR

MANGALURU TALUK
D K DISTRICT-575004

4 . MOHAMMED SHAKIR @ KANNA SHAKIR
S/O HAMEED @ KUNTA HAMEED
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
R/AT D NO.2-168/2
SADATH MANZEL, GANADABETTU
NEAR ABUBAKKAR HOTEL
KANNURU, MANGALURU TALUK
D K DISTRICT-575009

5 . THANZIL
S/O U A RAZAK
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS,
R/AT 14-76-8
HALEKOTE, MULLIGUDDE
ULLALA, MANGALURU TALUK
D K DISTRICT-575205

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI:LETHIF.B., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI: MUZAFFAR AHMED, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY MANGALURU NORTH POLICE STATION,
D K DISTRICT
REP BY SPP
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU-560001

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI:V.M. SHEELAVANT, SPP-I A/W
SRI: THEJESH.P., HCGP)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED U/S 439 CR.PC PRAYING TO
ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON BAIL IN CR.NO.133/2019 MANGALURU
NORTH P.S., D.K., FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS
143,147,148,188,353,332,324,427,307,120B R/W 149 OF IPC AND
SECTION 2(A)(B) OF KPDL P ACT.

IN CRL.P.957 OF 2020

BETWEEN

MOHAMMED MARWAN
S/O AHAMED KHADER
AGED ABOUT 19 YEARS,
R/AT DOOR NO.16-80
NEAR DARKHASTH MASJID
SHIRVA VILLAGE UDUPI DISTRICT
PIN-574 575

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI: LETHIF B, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY MANGALURU SOUTH POLICE STATION
D K DISTRICT
REP BY SPP
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU-560001

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI:V.M. SHEELAVANT, SPP-I A/W
SRI: THEJESH.P., HCGP)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED U/S 439 CR.PC PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON BAIL IN THE CR.NO.237/2019 OF MANGALURU SOUTH P.S., D.K., MANGALURU FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 143, 147, 148, 353, 332, 333, 307, 427, 324, 326, 188 AND 149 OF IPC AND SEC.2A OF KARNATAKA PREVENTION OF DESTRUCTION AND LOSS OF PROPERTY ACT 1981.

THESE CRIMINAL PETITIONS COMING ON FOR ORDERS THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

ORDER

Petitioners in the above cases are arrested and remanded to judicial custody on the charge of being members of unlawful assembly armed with lethal weapons, attempting to set fire to North Police Station, Mangaluru and obstructing the police from discharging their duties and causing damage to public property etc., in violation of the prohibitory order imposed by the Commissioner of Police, Mangaluru, under section 144 Cr.P.C. from 9.00 p.m. on 18.12.2019 till 12.00 midnight of 20.12.2019.

The cases have been registered against the petitioners in Crime No.133/2019 in North Police Station, Mangaluru under sections 143, 147, 148, 188, 353, 332, 324, 427, 307, 120B r/w.149 of IPC, 1860 and section 2(A) of the Karnataka Prevention of Destruction & Loss of Property Act, 1981 and section 174 Cr.P.C. and Crime No.237/2019 in South Police Station, Mangaluru under sections 143, 147, 148, 353, 332, 333, 307, 427, 324, 326, 188 and 149 of IPC, 1860 and section 2(A)

of the Karnataka Prevention of Destruction & Loss of Property Act, 1981.

2. The applications filed by the petitioners for their release on bail have been rejected by the I Addl. District and Sessions Judge, Dakshina Kannada, Mangaluru.

3(i) In Criminal Petition No.776 of 2020, petitioners are arrayed as accused Nos.5, 13, 11, 14 and 10 respectively in Crime No.133/2019. Petitioner No.1 was arrested on 20.12.2019, petitioner Nos.2 and 5 were arrested on 26.12.2019 and petitioner Nos.3 and 4 were arrested on 29.12.2019.

3(ii) In Criminal Petition No.778 of 2020, petitioners are arrayed as accused Nos.1, 8, 3, 4, 6, 7, 17, 19, 20 and 9 respectively in Crime No.133/2019. Petitioner Nos.1, 4, 5 and 6 were arrested on 20.12.2019, petitioner Nos.7, 8 and 9 were arrested on 29.12.2019 and petitioner No.10 was arrested on 25.12.2019.

3(iii) In Criminal Petition No.860 of 2020, petitioners are arrayed as accused Nos.15, 16, 12, 18 and 2 in Crime

No.133/2019. Petitioner Nos.1, 2 and 4 were arrested on 29.12.2019, petitioner No.3 was arrested on 26.12.2019 and petitioner No.5 was arrested on 20.12.2019.

3(iv) In Criminal Petition No.957 of 2020, petitioner is arrayed as accused No.1 in Crime No.237/2019 and was arrested on 20.12.2019.

4. Petitioners contend that they have been falsely implicated in the alleged offences without there being specific evidence of their presence at the spot of occurrence. The allegations constituting the ingredients of offences are not forthcoming in the remand application or in the complaint. Petitioners are doing different activities and business in the city of Mangaluru and some of the petitioners had come to the city for treatment and purchase of household articles and they were not members of any organization. The respondent Police themselves fired from their service weapons and killed two innocent public and injured several other individuals during the occurrence. The police have not registered even a single case on

the complaints filed by the injured and relatives of the dead persons and thus the petitioners seek their release on bail.

5. Learned SPP-I appearing for respondent has filed detailed statement of objections, opposing grant of bail *inter alia* contending that the petitioners and other accused persons conspired to create disturbance opposing Citizenship (Amendment) Act and National Register of Citizens. ("CAA" and "NRC" for short) and on 19.12.2019, despite prohibitory order being in force, petitioners were holding in their hands sticks, jellistones, soda bottles and glass pieces and hurled sticks and stones at the police station and were found placing pipe pieces, drums, pull carts, old iron gates across east side Azizuddin road and on the road leading to Bombay Hotel on the south side and stacking tyres and burning the same and thereby obstructed the traffic movements and throwing burning tyres at a seized lorry bearing No.GJ.12.O.8131 parked within the police station compound. The involvement of the petitioners is evident from the CCTV footage procured from the place of occurrence and vicinity. The petitioners are guilty of making attempt to murder

police personnel and causing destruction of public property. Under the said circumstances, in the event of release of the petitioners on bail, there is likelihood that they might again engage in acts of disturbing public peace. Further it is stated that the petitioners are active workers of PFI(Popular Front of India), a Muslim Organization and if the petitioners are released on bail, there is likelihood of continuing their illegal activities and waging war against the laws of the State and the Nation and there is possibility of committing grave offences like sedition/treason by joining hands with the Organization.

6. I have heard learned counsel for petitioners and learned SPP-I appearing for the respondent/State.

7. Learned counsel for petitioners has filed a memo along with copies of 31 FIRs and copies of photos of injured victims, deceased and police and copies of complaints filed by the injured and family members of the deceased against the police along with details of 31 cases and would submit that in respect of the very same occurrence, police have refused to register FIRs on the complaints lodged by the victims and family

members of the deceased who died due to police firing. Learned counsel has placed reliance on the following decisions:-

1. *SUSHILA AGGARWAL AND OTHERS vs. STATE (NCT OF DELHI) AND ANOTHER*, 2020 SCC Online SC 98
2. *STATE THROUGH SPECIAL INVESTIGATION TEAM vs. SAJJAN KUMAR*, 2018 SCC Online Del 7350
3. *ANDHRA PRADESH CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE. REP BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY vs STATE OF A.P. AND ANR*, 2008 CrI.L.J. 402
4. *PEOPLE'S UNION FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES & ANR. vs. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ORS*, Criminal Appeal No.1255/1999 and connected cases decided on 23.09.2014
5. *LALITA KUMARI vs. GOVERNMENT OF UTTAR PRADESH AND OTHERS*, (2014) 2 SCC 1
6. *STATE BY KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA, POLICE STATION, BENGALURU vs. M.R. HIREMETH*, (2019) 7 SCC 515
7. *STATE OF TELANGANA vs. MANAGIPET ALIAS MANGIPET SARVESHWAR REDDY*, 2019 SCC Online SC 1559
8. *PRAHLADBHAI JAGABHAI PATEL & Another vs. THE STATE OF GUJARAT*, Criminal Appeal No.196/2018 decided on 28.01.2020

8. I have considered the submissions made at the Bar and have also perused the case records produced by SPP-I.

The history of bail has been retraced by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent case, decided on 29.01.2020, in the

context of section 438 of Cr.P.C., in *SUSHILA AGARVAL vs. STATE NCT OF Delhi, 2020 SCC Online SC 98 in SLP (Criminal) Nos.7281-7282/2017*. Para 75 of the said judgment is worth extracting. It reads thus:-

75. *The concept of bail, i.e., preserving the liberty of citizen-even accused of committing offences, but subject to conditions, dates back of antiquity. Justinian I in the collections of laws and interpretations which prevailed in his times, Codex Justinianus (or 'Code Jus') in Book 9 titled Title 3(2) stipulated that "no accused person shall under any circumstances, be confined in prison before he is convicted". The second example of norm of the distant past is the Magna Carta which by clause 44 enacted that "people who live outside the forest need not in future appear before the Royal Justices of the forest in answer to the general summons unless they are actually involved in proceedings or are sureties for someone who has been seized for a forest offence. "Clear Parliamentary recognition of bail took shape in later enactments in the UK through the Habeas Corpus Act 1677 and the English Bill of Rights, 1689 which prescribed that "excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted".*

In para 135 of the said judgment, in conclusion, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed thus:

135. The history of our republic- and indeed, the freedom movement has shown how the likelihood of arbitrary arrest and indefinite detention and the lack of safeguards played an important role in rallying the people to demand independence. Witness the Rowlatt Act, the nationwide protests against it, the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre and several other incidents, where the general public were exercising their right to protest but were brutally suppressed and eventually jailed for long. The spectre of arbitrary and heavy-handed arrests; too often, to harass and humiliate citizens, and oftentimes, at the interest of powerful individuals (and not to further any meaningful investigation into offences) led to the enactment of Section 438. Despite several Law commission reports and recommendations of several committees and commissions, arbitrary and groundless arrests continue as a pervasive phenomenon. Parliament has not thought it appropriate to curtail the power or discretion of the courts, in granting pre-arrest or anticipatory bail, especially regarding the duration, or till charge

sheet is filed, or in serious crimes. Therefore, it would not be in the larger interests of society if the court, by judicial interpretation, limits the exercise of that power; the danger of such an exercise would be that in fractions, little by little, the discretion, advisedly kept wide, would shrink to a very narrow and unrecognizably tiny portion, thus frustrating the objective behind the provision, which has stood the test of time, these 46 years.

9. In the instant case, FIRs in Crime No.133/2019 and Crime No.237/2019 are registered on the allegations that the petitioners were members of an unlawful assembly consisting of 1500-2000 Muslim youth and that they conspired together to set fire to the police station and cause destruction to the public properties and that they were armed with sticks, stones and soda bottles etc.

10. In an offence involving large number of accused, identity and participation of each accused must be fixed with reasonable certainty. In the present cases, a perusal of the case

records produced by the learned SPP-I indicate that the identity of the accused involved in the alleged incident appear to have been fixed on the basis of their affiliation to PFI and they being members of Muslim community. Though it is stated that the involvement of the petitioners is captured in the CCTV footage and photographs, no such material is produced before this Court showing the presence of any one of the petitioners at the spot armed with deadly weapons. In the statement of objections, it is stated that there was a hint as to holding of protest by the Muslim youth on 19.12.2019, opposing implementation of CAA by the Central Government and in that connection, the Commissioner of Police, Mangaluru had imposed prohibitory order under section 144 Cr.P.C. from 9.00 p.m. on 18.12.2019 till 12.00 midnight of 20.12.2019. This assertion indicates that common object of the assembly was to oppose the implementation of CAA and NRC which by itself is not an "unlawful object" within the meaning of section 141 of IPC.

11. The material collected by the Investigating Agency does not contain any specific evidence as to the presence of any

one of the petitioners at the spot; on the other hand, omnibus allegations are made against the Muslim crowd of 1500 - 2000, alleging that they were armed with weapons like stones, soda bottles and glass pieces. The photographs produced by learned SPP-I depict that hardly any member of the crowd were armed with weapons except one of them holding a bottle. In none of these photographs, police station or policemen are seen in the vicinity. On the other hand, photographs produced by the petitioners disclose that the policemen themselves were pelting stones on the crowd. That apart, petitioners have produced copies of the complaints lodged by the dependants of the deceased who died due to police firing and the endorsement made thereon reveal that eventhough the law required the police to register independent FIRs in view of the specific complaint made against the police officers making out cognizable offences, the respondent police have failed to register FIRs which would go to show that a deliberate attempt is underway to cover up police excesses by implicating innocent persons at the whims and caprice of the police. Overzealousness of the police is also evident from the fact that FIRs are registered under section 307

IPC against the persons killed by the police themselves. In the wake of the counter allegations made against the police and in the backdrop of the failure of the police to register the FIRs based on the complaints lodged by the victims, the possibility of false and mistaken implication cannot be ruled out.

12. In the above circumstances, it would be travesty of justice to deny bail to the petitioners and sacrifice their liberties to the mercy of the District Administration and the police. The records indicate that deliberate attempt has been made to trump-up evidence and to deprive the liberties of petitioners by fabricating evidence. It is not disputed that none of the petitioners have any criminal antecedents. The allegations levelled against the petitioners are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. There is no direct evidence to connect the petitioners with the alleged offences. Investigation appears to be *mala fide* and partisan. In the said circumstances, in order to protect the rights and liberties of the petitioners, it is necessary to admit them to bail. Hence the following:-

ORDER

1. Criminal Petition No.776 of 2020 is allowed.

- a) Petitioner Nos.1 to 5/ accused No.5 – Sri.Ashik @ Mohammad Asik, accused No.13 – Sri.Mohammed Suhal, accused No.11 – Naseeruddin, accused No.14 – Mohammed Shakeer and accused No.10 – Sri. Kalandar Basha respectively are ordered to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) each with two sureties each for the likesum to the satisfaction of the jurisdictional court.
- b) They shall appear before the court as and when required.
- c) They shall not threaten or allure the prosecution witnesses in whatsoever manner.
- d) They shall not get involved in similar offences.
- e) They shall not leave the territorial limits of the Trial Court without prior permission of the Trial Court.

2. Criminal Petition No.778 of 2020 is allowed.

a) Petitioner Nos.1 to 10/accused No.1 - Mohammad Azar, accused No.8 - Sri.Abdul Afeez, accused No.3 - Sri.Harzan, accused No.4 - Sri.Mohammed Nazeem, accused No.6 - Sri.Anwar Hussain, accused No.7 - Sri.Mohammed Iqbal, accused No.17 - Sri.Kaisal @ Mohammed Kaisal, accused No.19 - Sri.Javed Akthar @ Baas Javed, accused No.20 - Sri.Mohammed Jiyad and accused No.9 - Sri.Fayaz @ Mohammed Fayaz respectively are ordered to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) each with two sureties each for the likesum to the satisfaction of the jurisdictional court.

b) They shall appear before the court as and when required.

c) They shall not threaten or allure the prosecution witnesses in whatsoever manner.

d) They shall not get involved in similar offences.

e) They shall not leave the territorial limits of the Trial Court without prior permission of the Trial Court.

3. Criminal Petition No.860 of 2020 is **allowed**.
- a) Petitioner Nos.1 to 5/accused No.15 - Sri.Abdul Jaleel, accused No.16 - Sri.Sayed Ali Rahish, accused No.12 - Sri.Mohammed Farook, accused No.18 - Sri.Mohammed Shakir @ Kanna Shakir, accused No.2 - Sri.Thanzil respectively are ordered to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) each with two sureties each for the likesum to the satisfaction of the jurisdictional court.
 - b) They shall appear before the court as and when required.
 - c) They shall not threaten or allure the prosecution witnesses in whatsoever manner.
 - d) They shall not get involved in similar offences.
 - e) They shall not leave the territorial limits of the Trial Court without prior permission of the Trial Court.
4. Criminal Petition No.957 of 2020 is **allowed**.
- a) Petitioner/accused No.1 - Sri.Mohammed Marwan is ordered to be enlarged on bail on

furnishing bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) with two sureties for the likesum to the satisfaction of the jurisdictional court.

- b) He shall appear before the court as and when required.
- c) He shall not threaten or allure the prosecution witnesses in whatsoever manner.
- d) He shall not get involved in similar offences.
- e) He shall not leave the territorial limits of the Trial Court without prior permission of the Trial Court.

**Sd/-
JUDGE**

Bss