ITEM NO.5+11 Court 6 (Video Conferencing) SECTION II

## SUPREME COURT OF INDIA RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.4633/2021

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 20-11-2018 in CRMBA No. 209280/2017 passed by the High Court Of Judicature at Allahabad)

SAUDAN SINGH Petitioner(s)

**VERSUS** 

THE STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. )

WITH

SLP(Crl) No. 4634/2021 (II) (FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4849/2021 (II) (FOR ORDERS ON THE QUESTION OF MAINTAINABILITY OF PETITION.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4844/2021 (II) (FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4848/2021 (II)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.72916/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.72917/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.72920/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No.72922/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT)

SLP(Crl) No. 4847/2021 (II) (FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4643/2021 (II)

SLP(Crl) No. 4396/2021 (II)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4642/2021 (II)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4641/2021 (II)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4640/2021 (II)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4332/2021 (II)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Crl) No. 4639/2021 (II)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R)

SLP(Crl) No. 4638/2021 (II)

```
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)
 SLP(Crl) No. 4213/2021 (II)
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)
SLP(Crl) No. 4637/2021 (II)
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)
SLP(Crl) No. 4635/2021 (II)
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)
 SLP(Crl) No. 4636/2021 (II)
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)
SLP(Crl) No. 5472/2021 (II)
SLP(Crl) No. 6928/2021 (II)
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)
SLP (Crl) No.6449/2021
(I.A.No.107174/2021- Exemption from filing C/C of the impugned
judgment
I.A. No.107176/2021- Exemption from filing O.T.
I.A. No.107178/2021- Exemption from filing Affidavit)
Date: 05-10-2021 These petitions were called on for hearing today.
         HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KISHAN KAUL
CORAM:
         HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
For Petitioner(s)
                    Mr. Pardeep Gupta, Adv.
                    Mr. Parinav Gupta, Adv.
                    Mr. Krishna Kumar, Adv.
                    Ms. Mansi Gupta, Adv.
                    Ms. Nandani Gupta, Adv.
                    Ms. Mamta Sharma, Adv.
                    Dr.
                        (Mrs.) Vipin Gupta, AOR
                    Mr. Viraj R. Datar, Sr. Adv.
                    Mr. Nagendra Singh, Adv.
                    Mr. Ashish Pandey, Adv.
                    Mr. Amardeep Gaur, Adv.
                    Mr. Umakant Mishra, Adv.
                    Mr. Ronak Karanpuria, AOR
                    Mr. Indresh Upadhyay, Adv.
                    Mr. Brijesh Upadhyay, Adv.
                    Mr. Akhilesh Yadav, Adv.
                    Mr. Mohammad Arif, Adv.
                    Ms. Pankhuri, Adv.
                    Mr. Dhruv Chawla, Adv.
                    Mr. Tushar Singh, AOR
For Respondent(s)
                    Mr. Shashank Shekhar Singh, AOR
```

Ms. Garima Prashad, Sr. Adv./AAG

Mr. Sarvesh Singh Baghel, AOR

Mr. Srinivas Vishven, Adv.

Ms. Marbiang N. Khongwir, Adv.

Mr. Parth Yadav, Adv.

Ms. Deepika Kalia, Adv.

Mr. Dhawal Uniyal, Adv.

Mr. Vishnu Shankar Jain, AOR

Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, AOR

Mr. Shantanu Singh, Adv.

Mrs. Priyanka Singh, Adv.

Mr. Rohit Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Neelambar Jha, Adv.

Mr. Chandra Shekhar, Adv.

Mr. Manish Shanker Srivastava, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Kumar Singh, AOR

Ms. Pallavi Baghel, Adv.

Ms. Kalpana, Adv.

Ms. Sweta Rani, AOR

Mr. Anant Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Yashvardhan, Adv.

Mr. Apoorv Shukla, AOR

Ms. Smita Kant, Adv.

Ms. Ishita Farsaiya, Adv.

Ms. Prabhleen Kaur, Adv.

Ms. Kritika Nagpal, Adv.

Ms. Bhavya Bhatia, Adv.

# UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following O R D E R

An affidavit has been filed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad that it is in agreement with the suggestions/ proposals listed as criteria for bail by the Government.

If we peruse the said suggestions, in our view, it will make the exercise of grant of bail even more cumbersome. The fact of the matter is that if an appeal is pending at the High Court stage and the convict has already undergone eight years of actual sentence, exceptions apart, in most cases bail would be the rule. Despite this the cases are not coming up for consideration. We are not clear as to how much time does it take for a bail application to be

listed in such a case. There may be convicts who may not be able to have the requisite access to legal advice for moving the bail application. The High Court must explore whether in all cases where convicts have undergone a sentence of actual eight years, the convicts can be considered for grant of bail.

In these suggestions, there are some exceptions sought to be carved out which have been extracted as under:-

- "1. Heinous nature of Crime:
- (a) <u>Prohibited categories</u>: To ensure public peace and the well-being of the society, life convicts who are hardened criminals, repeat offenders, kidnappers, in crimes related to massacre (three or more than three murders), habitual criminals, and fall in prohibited categories as per the U.P. Jail Standing Policy no bail should be granted."

We are also conscious of a scenario where an appeal comes up for hearing and the appellant may be seeking adjournment rather than arguing the appeal. That case certainly would not be one for grant of bail as the Court is willing to bestow consideration on the merits of the appeal.

We are also in agreement that the convict must approach the High Court first as otherwise this Court is being unnecessary burdened but then there must be a mechanism to see that if he approaches the High Court, those bail applications are listed promptly.

In the conspectus of our broad observations, it is incumbent on the High Court to place before us as to how they propose to see that the cases mentioned aforesaid are taken up for consideration for grant of bail.

We may note that there may be even convicts in custody in

cases other than life sentence cases and in those cases again the

broad parameter of 50 per cent of the actual sentence undergone can

be the basis for grant of bail.

We grant four weeks' time to the High Court to place before us

their policy strategy in this behalf.

We would not like to derail the consideration of all these

matters pending before us and thus consider it appropriate that

all these matters are placed before the Bench of the High Court

promptly so that their bail applications are considered.

In order to facilitate further examination of this problem, a

separate Suo Moto petition can be registered and placed before the

Court for further directions.

The Registry to register the Suo Moto proceeding and place it

before Court on 16th November, 2021.

The petitions listed before us for bail be transferred to the

High Court of Allahabad to be taken up urgently.

List after four weeks.

(RASHMI DHYANI)
COURT MASTER

(SUNIL KUMAR RAJVANSHI)
BRANCH OFFICER

5