

[2022] 6 S.C.R. 763

DHANANJAY RAI @ GUDDU RAI

A

v.

STATE OF BIHAR

(Criminal Appeal No.803 of 2017)

JULY 14, 2022

B

**[ABHAY S. OKA AND M.M. SUNDRESH, JJ.]**

*Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – s.374(2) – Appellant convicted u/ss.302 and 120B of IPC and s.27(1) of the Arms Act, 1959 – He preferred appeal – High Court of Patna admitted the appeal for hearing – Meanwhile, appellant went absconding – High Court dismissed the appeal without adverting to merits on ground that appellant was absconding – Whether an appeal against conviction filed by an accused u/sub-section (2) of s.374 CrPC can be dismissed on ground that the accused was absconding – Held: The law does not envisage dismissal of appeal for default or non-prosecution but only contemplates disposal on merits after perusal of the record – In the present case, the High Court had relied upon an earlier High Court decision based on r.8 of Chapter XII of the Patna High Court Rules which predicates that no appeal against conviction shall be heard for admission unless the accused has surrendered to the order of the Court below convicting him to a sentence of imprisonment except in a case where the appellant has been released on bail by the trial court after convicting him – In the case in hand, a non-bailable warrant was issued against the appellant and his appeal was already admitted – Therefore, the said rule, which applies to pre-admission stage, was not applicable in this case – Anguish expressed by High Court about the brazen action of the appellant of absconding and defeating the administration of justice can be well understood – However, that is no ground to dismiss an appeal against conviction, which was already admitted for final hearing, for non-prosecution without adverting to merits – Appeal remanded to High Court for consideration on merits – Patna High Court Rules – Chapter XII, Rule 8.*

C

D

E

F

G

H

A           **Remanding the matter to High Court, the Court**

B           **HELD:1. In the impugned judgment, the Division Bench**  
of the Patna High Court has itself recorded that it is deviating  
from the settled position of law. Such an approach cannot be  
countenanced. The well settled law can be found in the decision  
of this Court of a Bench consisting of three Hon'ble Judges in  
the case of *Bani Singh & Ors. v. State of U.P.* It was held that the  
plain language of Sections 385-386 CrPC does not contemplate  
dismissal of the appeal for non-prosecution simpliciter. On the  
contrary, the CrPC envisages disposal of the appeal on merits  
after perusal and scrutiny of the record. The law clearly expects  
the appellate court to dispose of the appeal on merits, not merely  
by perusing the reasoning of the trial court in the judgment, but  
by cross-checking the reasoning with the evidence on record  
with a view to satisfying itself that the reasoning and findings  
recorded by the trial court are consistent with the material on  
record. The law, therefore, does not envisage the dismissal of  
the appeal for default or non-prosecution but only contemplates  
disposal on merits after perusal of the record. [Para 6][767-D;  
768-E-G]

E           **2. In the instant case, the High Court relied upon its earlier**  
decision in the case of *Daya Shankar Singh* which was based on  
Rule 8 of Chapter XII of the Patna High Court Rules which  
predicates that no appeal against conviction shall be heard for  
admission unless the accused has surrendered to the order of  
the Court below convicting him to a sentence of imprisonment  
except in a case where the appellant has been released on bail by  
the trial court after convicting him. In the case in hand, the appeal  
was already admitted. Therefore, the said rule, which applies to  
the pre-admission stage, was not applicable in this case. [Para  
7][770-B-C]

G           **3. The anguish expressed by the Division Bench about the**  
brazen action of the appellant of absconding and defeating the  
administration of justice can be well understood. However, that  
is no ground to dismiss an appeal against conviction, which was  
already admitted for final hearing, for non-prosecution without

H

DHANANJAY RAI @ GUDDU RAI v. STATE OF BIHAR 765

adverting to merits. Therefore, the impugned judgment will have to be set aside and the appeal will have to be remanded to the High Court for consideration on merits. [Para 8][770-D-E] A

*Bani Singh & Ors. v. State of U.P. (1996) 4 SCC 720 : [1996] 3 Suppl. SCR 247 – relied on.* B

*Daya Shankar Singh & Anr. v. State of Bihar (2004) SCC Online Pat 1189 – held inapplicable.*

*Shyam Deo Pandey & Ors. v. State of Bihar (1971) 1 SCC 855 : [1971] Suppl. SCR 133; Surya Baksh Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2013) 2 SCALE 492 : [2013] 14 SCR 452; K.S. Panduranga v. State of Karnataka (2013) 3 SCC 721 : [2013] 4 SCR 155 and Ram Naresh Yadav v. State of Bihar AIR 1987 SC 1500 – referred to.* C

#### Case Law Reference D

[1971] Suppl. SCR 133	referred to	Para 4	
[2013] 14 SCR 452	referred to	Para 4	
[2013] 4 SCR 155	referred to	Para 4	E
[1996] 3 Suppl. SCR 247	relied on	Para 6	
AIR 1987 SC 1500	referred to	Para 6	

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION: Criminal Appeal No.803 of 2017. F

From the Judgment and Order dated 25.08.2015 of the High Court of Judicature at Patna in Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 936 of 2009.

Anuj Prakaash, Siddhartha Jha, Advs. for the Appellant. G

Saket Singh, Mrs. Niranjana Singh, Advs. for the Respondent.

H

A The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

**ABHAY S. OKA, J.**

B 1. The short issue involved in this appeal is whether an appeal against conviction filed by an accused under Sub-Section (2) of Section 374 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, 'Cr. P.C.') can be dismissed on the ground that the accused is absconding.

C 2. The appellant was convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and Section 27(1) of the Arms Act, 1959. The maximum substantive sentence is of life imprisonment. Against the aforesaid judgment and order dated 04<sup>th</sup> September 2009 of conviction passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Buxar in Sessions Trial No.338 of 2006, an appeal was preferred by the appellant before the High Court of Patna. On 29<sup>th</sup> October 2009, a Division Bench of the High Court admitted the appeal for hearing. When the application for suspension of sentence filed by the appellant came up before a Division Bench of the High Court, it was brought to the notice of the Court that the appellant was absconding. Thereafter, a non-bailable warrant was issued against the appellant. As the appellant was absconding, the Director General of Police announced a reward to the informant who could report the whereabouts of the appellant.

F 3. By the impugned judgment and order dated 25<sup>th</sup> August 2015, a Division Bench of the High Court of Patna dismissed the appeal without adverting to the merits of the appeal on the ground that the appellant was absconding.

G 4. The Division Bench held that though the remedy of an appeal is a valuable right, the appellant forfeited his right to prefer an appeal the moment he escaped from the custody and flagrantly abused the process of law. The learned Judges held that such deliberate act on the part of the appellant amounts to defiance of the criminal administration of justice. The Division Bench referred to a decision of this Court in the case of **Shyam Deo Pandey & Ors. v. State of Bihar**<sup>1</sup>. The Division Bench referred to another decision of this Court in the case of **Surya Baksh**

H <sup>1</sup> (1971) 1 SCC 855

DHANANJAY RAI @ GUDDU RAI v. STATE OF BIHAR 767  
[ABHAY S. OKA, J.]

**Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh**<sup>2</sup> as well as a decision of the same High Court in the case of **Daya Shankar Singh & Anr. v. State of Bihar**<sup>3</sup>. After advertng to another decision of this Court in the case of **K.S. Panduranga v. State of Karnataka**<sup>4</sup>, the Division Bench held that the circumstances of the case before it were exceptional and, therefore, the Court was required to deviate from the settled principle of law that once the appellate court has refused to dismiss the appeal summarily, the same must be heard on merits. A B

5. After having heard the learned counsel appearing for the appellant and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State, for the reasons which are recording, we have no option but to set aside the impugned judgment and remand the appeal for fresh consideration of the High Court. C

6. In the impugned judgment, the Division Bench of the Patna High Court has itself recorded that it is deviating from the settled position of law. Such an approach cannot be countenanced. The well settled law can be found in the decision of this Court of a Bench consisting of three Hon'ble Judges in the case of **Bani Singh & Ors. v. State of U.P.**<sup>5</sup>. The issue before this Court in the said case was whether the High Court was justified in dismissing an appeal against conviction for non-prosecution. This Court noted the conflict in the views expressed by two co-ordinate Benches of this Court in the case of **Shyam Deo**<sup>1</sup> and **Ram Naresh Yadav v. State of Bihar**<sup>6</sup>. Paragraphs 13 to 15 of the said decision are relevant, which read thus : D E

“13. What then is the area of conflict between the two decisions of this Court? In *Shyam Deo case* [(1971) 1 SCC 855 : 1971 SCC (Cri) 353 : AIR 1971 SC 1606] , this Court ruled that once the appellate court has admitted the appeal to be heard on merits, it cannot dismiss the appeal for non-prosecution for non-appearance of the appellant or his counsel, but must dispose of the appeal on merits after examining the record of the case. It next held that if the appellant or his counsel is absent, the appellate F G

---

<sup>2</sup> (2013) 2 SCALE 492 = (2014) 14 SCC 222

<sup>3</sup> 2004 SCC Online Pat 1189

<sup>4</sup> (2013) 3 SCC 721

<sup>5</sup> (1996) 4 SCC 720

<sup>6</sup> AIR 1987 SC 1500

H

A court is not bound to adjourn the appeal but it can dispose it of on merits after perusing the record. In *Ram Naresh Yadav case* [AIR 1987 SC 1500 : 1987 Cri LJ 1856], the Court did not analyse the relevant provisions of the Code nor did it notice the view taken in *Shyam Deo case* [(1971) 1 SCC 855 : 1971 SCC (Cri) 353 : AIR 1971 SC 1606] but held that if the appellant's counsel is absent, the proper course would be to dismiss the appeal for non-prosecution but not on merits; it can be disposed of on merits only after hearing the appellant or his counsel or after appointing another counsel at State cost to argue the case on behalf of the accused.

C **14.** We have carefully considered the view expressed in the said two decisions of this Court and, **we may state that the view taken in *Shyam Deo case* [(1971) 1 SCC 855 : 1971 SCC (Cri) 353 : AIR 1971 SC 1606] appears to be sound except for a minor clarification which we consider necessary to mention.** The plain language of Section 385 makes it clear that if the appellate court does not consider the appeal fit for summary dismissal, it 'must' call for the record and Section 386 mandates that after the record is received, the appellate court may dispose of the appeal after hearing the accused or his counsel. **Therefore, the plain language of Sections 385-386 does not contemplate dismissal of the appeal for non-prosecution *simpliciter*. On the contrary, the Code envisages disposal of the appeal on merits after perusal and scrutiny of the record. The law clearly expects the appellate court to dispose of the appeal on merits, not merely by perusing the reasoning of the trial court in the judgment, but by cross-checking the reasoning with the evidence on record with a view to satisfying itself that the reasoning and findings recorded by the trial court are consistent with the material on record. The law, therefore, does not envisage the dismissal of the appeal for default or non-prosecution but only contemplates disposal on merits after perusal of the record. Therefore, with respect, we find it difficult to agree with the suggestion in *Ram Naresh Yadav case* [AIR 1987 SC 1500 : 1987 Cri**

H

DHANANJAY RAI @ GUDDU RAI v. STATE OF BIHAR 769  
[ABHAY S. OKA, J.]

**LJ 1856] that if the appellant or his pleader is not present, the proper course would be to dismiss an appeal for non-prosecution.** A

15. Secondly, the law expects the appellate court to give a hearing to the appellant or his counsel, if he is present, and to the public prosecutor, if he is present, before disposal of the appeal on merits. B  
Section 385 posits that if the appeal is not dismissed summarily, the appellate court shall cause notice of the time and place at which the appeal will be heard to be given to the appellant or his pleader. Section 386 then provides that the appellate court shall, after perusing the record, hear the appellant or his pleader, if he C  
appears. It will be noticed that Section 385 provides for a notice of the time and place of hearing of the appeal to be given to either the appellant or his pleader and not to both presumably because notice to the pleader was also considered sufficient since he was representing the appellant. So also Section 386 provides for a D  
hearing to be given to the appellant or his lawyer, if he is present, and both need not be heard. It is the duty of the appellant and his lawyer to remain present on the appointed day, time and place when the appeal is posted for hearing. This is the requirement of the Code on a plain reading of Sections 385-386 of the Code. The law does not enjoin that the court shall adjourn the case if both the E  
appellant and his lawyer are absent. If the court does so as a matter of prudence or indulgence, it is a different matter, but it is not bound to adjourn the matter. It can dispose of the appeal after perusing the record and the judgment of the trial court. We would, however, hasten to add that if the accused is in jail and cannot, on F  
his own, come to court, it would be advisable to adjourn the case and fix another date to facilitate the appearance of the accused/appellant if his lawyer is not present. If the lawyer is absent, and the court deems it appropriate to appoint a lawyer at State expense to assist it, there is nothing in the law to preclude it from doing so. G  
We are, therefore, of the opinion and we say so with respect, that the Division Bench which decided *Ram Naresh Yadav case* [AIR 1987 SC 1500 : 1987 Cri LJ 1856] did not apply the provisions of Sections 385-386 of the Code correctly when it indicated that the

H

A           appellate court was under an obligation to adjourn the case to another date if the appellant or his lawyer remained absent.”

(emphasis added)

B           7. We may note here that the High Court relied upon its earlier decision in the case of **Daya Shankar Singh**<sup>3</sup> which was based on Rule 8 of Chapter XII of the Patna High Court Rules which predicates that no appeal against conviction shall be heard for admission unless the accused has surrendered to the order of the Court below convicting him to a sentence of imprisonment except in a case where the appellant has been released on bail by the trial court after convicting him. In the case C in hand, the appeal was already admitted on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2009. Therefore, the said rule, which applies to the pre-admission stage, was not applicable in this case.

D           8. The anguish expressed by the Division Bench about the brazen action of the appellant of absconding and defeating the administration of justice can be well understood. However, that is no ground to dismiss an appeal against conviction, which was already admitted for final hearing, for non-prosecution without adverting to merits. Therefore, the impugned judgment will have to be set aside and the appeal will have to be remanded to the High Court for consideration on merits.

E           9. We may note that subsequently, the appellant was taken into custody and in fact an application for bail made in this appeal was heard and rejected on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2018.

F           10. Since the appeal before the High Court is of the year 2009, the same will have to be heard expeditiously. If the appeal could not be heard within a reasonable time, in that event, the appellant will have to be granted a liberty to apply for suspension of sentence.

G           11. Accordingly, the impugned judgment and order dated 25<sup>th</sup> August 2015 is hereby set aside. Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No.936 of 2009 is remanded to the High Court of Judicature at Patna for hearing in accordance with the law.

H           12. Considering the fact that the appeal against conviction under Section 302 of IPC is of the year 2009, necessary priority deserves to be given to the disposal of the appeal. We, therefore, request the High



DHANANJAY RAI @ GUDDU RAI v. STATE OF BIHAR 771  
[ABHAY S. OKA, J.]

Court to ensure that appeal is disposed of as expeditiously as possible, A  
preferably within a period of six months from today.

13. In the event, that the appeal is not heard within a period of six  
months from today, it will be open to the appellant to apply for suspension  
of the sentence before the High Court.

14. Appeal is partly allowed in the above terms. B

Bibhuti Bhushan Bose

Matter remanded to High Court.