

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1759 OF 2017**  
(Arising out of S.L.P.(Criminal) No. 8439 of 2016)

SANTOSH S/O DWARKADAS FAFAT ... APPELLANT (S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA ... RESPONDENT (S)

**J U D G M E N T**

**KURIAN, J.:**

Leave granted.

2. The appellant is one of the accused in Crime No. 63 of 2016 registered at Goregaon Police Station, Goregaon, Maharashtra for offences under Section 408 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 read with Sections 3 and 7 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. The allegation is that he received misappropriated food-grains meant for public distribution. In the order dated 07.10.2016, the Additional Sessions Judge, Gondia rejected the application for anticipatory bail. The High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Nagpur Bench, as per order dated 24.10.2016 was also of the same view, although the same court had initially granted interim protection. Thus aggrieved, the appellant is

before this Court.

3. On 07.11.2016, this Court passed the following Order:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment, so as to enable him to obtain instructions, whether or not the petitioner is ready and willing to deposit the total amount of Rs.45,08,469/- for the misappropriated grains, referred to in the first information report.

At request, and in the interest of justice, post for hearing on 11.11.2016.

Instructions be obtained, in the meantime.”

4. The amount was deposited. Accordingly, the Court granted interim protection by order dated 18.11.2016 staying the arrest. On the submission made by the learned Counsel appearing for the State that the appellant was not cooperating with the investigation, this Court on 24.08.2017, passed the following Order:

“Learned counsel appearing for the respondent/State submits that in view of the order dated 18.11.2016 there is no cooperation on the part of the petitioner. Therefore, the order dated 18.11.2016 regarding the stay of arrest of the petitioner is modified to the effect that the Investigating Officer is free to arrest the petitioner. However, after arrest he shall be released on bail on execution of a personal bond to the tune of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lacs) with two solvent sureties for the like amount. The petitioner is directed to cooperate with the investigation by responding to the call and attending the place wherever and whenever required by the Investigating Officer.

The respondent/State is directed to file a status



terms of what the co-accused had already stated in the Statement under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The IO was of the opinion that the appellant was not cooperating because he kept reiterating that he had not purchased the food-grains. The purpose of custodial interrogation is not just for the purpose of confession. The right against self-incrimination is provided for in Article 20(3) of the Constitution. It is a well settled position in view of the Constitution Bench decision in **Selvi and others v. State of Karnataka**<sup>1</sup>, that Article 20(3) enjoys an “exalted status”. This provision is an essential safeguard in criminal procedure and is also meant to be a vital safeguard against torture and other coercive methods used by investigating authorities. Therefore, merely because the appellant did not confess, it cannot be said that the appellant was not cooperating with the investigation. However, in case, there is no cooperation on the part of the appellant for the completion of the investigation, it will certainly be open to the respondent to seek for cancellation of bail.

8. Having regard to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the view that the liberty as above should be left

---

<sup>1</sup> (2010) 7 SCC 263

to the jurisdictional Sessions Court, i.e., Sessions Court, Gondia.

9. In case there is no cooperation on the part of the appellant for the completion of the investigation, it will be open to the respondent to approach the Sessions Court, Gondia, Maharashtra in which case the Sessions Court having regard to the materials already collected by the IO, if so satisfied that the custodial interrogation of the appellant is still required for completion of the investigation, will be free to pass appropriate orders.

10. The appeal is disposed of as above.

.....J.  
**(KURIAN JOSEPH)**

.....J.  
**(R. BANUMATHI)**

**NEW DELHI;  
OCTOBER 10, 2017.**

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 8439/2016

SANTOSH S/O DWARKADAS FAFAT

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Respondent(s)

Date : 10-10-2017 This petition was called on for Judgment today.

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Garvesh Kabra, AOR  
Ms. Pooja Kabra, Adv.  
Ms. Nikita Kabra Jaju, Adv.For Respondent(s) Mr. Nishant Ramakantrao Katneshwarkar, AOR  
Ms. Deepa Kulkarni, Adv.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph pronounced the reportable Judgment of the Bench comprising His Lordship and Hon'ble Mrs. Justice R. Banumathi.

Leave granted. The appeal is disposed of.

As far as the deposit of Rs. 46,67,489/- made in this Court (along with accrued interest) is concerned, further orders, if required, will be passed subject to the orders, if any, passed by the trial court.

Pending Interlocutory Applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(JAYANT KUMAR ARORA)  
COURT MASTER

(RENU DIWAN)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed reportable Judgment is placed on the file)