



The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

CASE COMMENT

~ *Shruti Chourasiya*

ABSTRACT

*At its heart, the legal system constantly struggles to balance two things: keeping the public safe and protecting individual freedom. This case commentary looks closely at the landmark Supreme Court ruling in **Satendra Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation (2022)**—a massive turning point for personal liberty in India under **Article 21** of the Constitution.*

The case started because a trial court routinely rejected an accused person's bail and issued an arrest warrant, simply because a chargesheet had been filed, even though the person was never arrested during the actual investigation. Recognising this as a widespread, systemic issue, the Supreme Court stepped in to stop the common practice of police making arbitrary arrests and lower courts automatically sending people to jail.

*This case comment breaks down the Court's solution: a **four-part classification system** for crimes that simplifies how bail should be handled. It also examines the strict rules the Court set for both the police and lower courts regarding arrest procedures. Finally, the commentary discusses how this judgment aims to tackle the massive problem of overcrowded Indian prisons—where the majority of inmates are poor under-trials waiting for a hearing—and explores the Court's groundbreaking suggestion that India needs a dedicated, standalone "**Bail Act.**"*

CASE COMMENTARY: Satendra Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, 10 SCC 51 (2022)

CITATION: AIR 2022 SC 51

BENCH: Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul and Justice MM

Sundresh **JUDGEMENT OF THE DATE:** 11 th July 2022

INTRODUCTION

Arrest means to seize, capture or to bring to a stop or to make it inactive. It is generally the physical deprivation of liberty by a lawful authority when suspected of an offence or under an apprehension that he may commit an offence. The power of arrest generally lies with police under section 35 of BNSS and also with Magistrate u/s 41 and private person u/s 40. The power of arrest exercised by police is not absolute and courts repeatedly have held it in landmark cases. But, as the criminal jurisprudence is expanding, new questions pop up every time and are set by the apex court.

FACTS OF THE CASE

The applicant in the matter was the accused, and an FIR was filed by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) against him for seeking bribes while working as an Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner at the Employees Provident Fund Organisation's regional headquarters in Noida. The FIR was filed as the petitioner (Satender Kumar Antil) also identified as an accused was found to violate the Section 120-B of the Penal Code (penalty of criminal conspiracy) and Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act (offence pertaining to public servant being bribed). After the investigation was completed, a chargesheet was filed with the court, and the accused was not arrested before or after the filing of chargesheet. Notably, the court then took the chargesheet on record and further issued summons to the applicant, seeking his appearance in the court. The accused failed to appear before the court on the required date and then filed a petition for the issuance of an anticipatory bail. The court rejected his anticipatory bail application and issued a non-bailable warrant against him. Eventually, the matter was presented before the Supreme

Standard Print Reporter Citation (SCC): *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 S.C.C. 51 (India).

Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, [2025] INSC 909 (India), available at

https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0362dad6e273d32235ae02b7d32157/uploads/2026/01/202_6013186.pdf.

Satender Kumar Antil Case Presentation, Jharkhand Judicial Acad. (July 2025), <https://jajharkhand.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Antil-case-ppt.pdf>.

Court as the accused filed a special leave petition where the Supreme Court laid down a set of guidelines bifurcated into three sets of decisions that famously came to be known as the Antil Trilogy.

Standard Print Reporter Citation (SCC): *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 S.C.C. 51 (India).

Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, [2025] INSC 909 (India), available at https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0362dad6e273d32235ae02b7d32157/uploads/2026/01/202_6013186.pdf.

Satender Kumar Antil Case Presentation, Jharkhand Judicial Acad. (July 2025), <https://jajharkhand.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Antil-case-ppt.pdf>.

LEGAL ISSUES BEFORE THE COURT

Does Section 170 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC)-which deals with forwarding an accused to a magistrate upon completion of an investigation-mandate the police to arrest an individual at the time of filing a chargesheet, even if they co-operated throughout the probe and were never arrested during the investigation?

Whether compliance with the procedural safeguards against arbitrary arrest under Section 41 (power to arrest without warrant) and Section 41-A (notice of appearance before police officer) is a mandatory prerequisite before a court can remand an accused to custody.

Whether the Supreme Court should introduce a clear categorized framework for offenses based on their gravity to guide trial courts and magistrates in processing bail applications systematically.

Whether an accused person who was not arrested during the investigation and has responded to a court summons is entitled to have their bail application considered by the court without being forcibly taken into physical or judicial custody first.

Whether the systemic practice of lower courts mechanically rejecting bail- there by turning "jail into the rule and bail into the exception" violates Article 21 and contributes to the constitutional crisis of prison overcrowding with undertrial prisoners.

Whether India requires the central government to introduce a separate dedicated "Bail Act"(similar to the United Kingdom's Bail Act) to streamline, formalize and safeguard the right to bail.

Standard Print Reporter Citation (SCC): *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 S.C.C. 51 (India).

Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, [2025] INSC 909 (India), available at

https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0362dad6e273d32235ae02b7d32157/uploads/2026/01/202_6013186.pdf.

Satender Kumar Antil Case Presentation, Jharkhand Judicial Acad. (July 2025), <https://jajharkhand.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Antil-case-ppt.pdf>.

COURT'S DECISION

Section 170 CrPC states that if there is sufficient evidence, the investigating officer shall forward the accused "under custody" to a Magistrate. The Supreme Court clarified that the word "custody" in this context does not mean physical, police or judicial custody. Instead, it merely connotes the formal presentation or appearance of the accused before the court by the Investigating Officer at the time the chargesheet is submitted. The Court emphasized that merely because a police officer possesses the legal authority to arrest someone under the law does not mean they must exercise it. If an individual has cooperated with the probe, has not absconded, and is highly likely to obey court summons, routine arrest at the final stage is considered completely unnecessary.

The Court held that the judiciary cannot act as a passive rubber stamp for police arrests. When an accused is produced before a Magistrate, the court must inspect the case diary and the written reasons provided by the police. The court must satisfy itself that the arrest is objectively justified under the strict parameters of the law. If the police arrest an accused without complying with Section 41 or without issuing a notice under Section 41A (for offences punishable by 7 years or less), the Magistrate must refuse the remand request and release the accused. The Court stated that non-compliance with these procedural safeguards inherently violates Article 21 of the Constitution, automatically entitling the accused to be released on bail.

In the first judgement dated 28.07.2021, the court categorized offences into four categories and laid down guidelines to be followed in conditions like-

1. Firstly the person should not have been arrested during the investigation
2. The person should have co-operated throughout the whole

investigation The categorisation of offences is as follows-

Standard Print Reporter Citation (SCC): *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 S.C.C. 51 (India).

Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, [2025] INSC 909 (India), available at

https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0362dad6e273d32235ae02b7d32157/uploads/2026/01/202_6013186.pdf.

Satender Kumar Antil Case Presentation, Jharkhand Judicial Acad. (July 2025), <https://jajharkhand.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Antil-case-ppt.pdf>.

- a. Category A- It includes the offences whose punishment is imprisonment of 7 years or less and do not fall in other categories of B and D. Once the chargesheet has been filed by the investigating agency and it has been taken on record, then the following is to be done:
 3. First ordinary summon is to be issued, and appearance should be permitted through a lawyer.
 4. Next if the summons is duly served but the accused does not appear in the court, then a bailable warrant must be issued for physical appearance.
 5. After the bailable warrant is issued and served and the accused still does not appear, then a non-bailable warrant must be issued to the accused.
 6. If the accused files an application and an undertaking stating to appear in the court on a certain date or as required, then the non-bailable warrant issued can be converted into a bailable warrant, or into a summons, without insisting on his physical appearance.
 7. When the accused appears in the court, then without taking the custody of the accused, either bail application is decided by the court or interim bail is granted till the application is decided.

B. Category B- It includes offences which are punishable with death or imprisonment for life or imprisonment till death or imprisonment exceeding 7 years.

C. Category C- Includes offences which are punishable under special acts like PMLA, UAPA, Companies Act, NDPS Act etc.

D. Category D- Includes Economic Offences that are not covered under any special act.

On 16.12.2021, the Supreme Court issued clarifications regarding the previous order that the primary intention behind the order was to expand the scope and simplify the process of bail, not to restrict it.

Standard Print Reporter Citation (SCC): *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 S.C.C. 51 (India).

Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, [2025] INSC 909 (India), available at

https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0362dad6e273d32235ae02b7d32157/uploads/2026/01/202_6013186.pdf.

Satender Kumar Antil Case Presentation, Jharkhand Judicial Acad. (July 2025), <https://jajharkhand.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Antil-case-ppt.pdf>.

To claim the benefit of being considered for bail without being taken into custody, the accused must satisfy two key preliminary criteria i.e., The investigating agency did not find it necessary to arrest the accused during the entire course of the probe and the accused consistently cooperated with the investigating officer, responding to notices and appearing whenever summoned.

Hereinafter, in this case the court observed that the prisons were overcrowded with undertrial inmates and cautioned the State should not be run as a "police state" in a democracy. It reaffirmed that grant of bail should not be refused for any just reason. The court also held that the unjustified bail is violative of Article 21.

The Bail Act of the United Kingdom takes into consideration various factors. It is an attempt to have a comprehensive law dealing with bails by following a simple procedure. The Act takes into consideration clogging of the prisons with the undertrial prisoners, cases involving the issuance of warrants, granting of bail both before and after conviction, exercise of the power by the investigating agency and the court, violation of the bail conditions, execution of bond and sureties on the unassailable principle of presumption and right to get bail. Exceptions have been carved out as mentioned in Schedule I dealing with different contingencies and factors including the nature and continuity of offence. They also include Special Acts as well.

LEGAL REASONING

The Court rooted its entire logic in Article 21 of the Constitution of India (Right to Life and Personal Liberty). It reaffirmed that personal liberty is paramount and cannot be curtailed routinely. Under Article 21, any legal process depriving an individual of liberty must be "just, fair, and reasonable". Rejections lacking clear, recorded reasons or based solely on the severity of the allegation fail this constitutional threshold. The Court drew a sharp line between a police officer possessing the statutory power to arrest and having the legal justification to exercise it. Liberty is a core constitutional value. Pre-trial detention must never act as a form of punitive punishment before a formal conviction.

Standard Print Reporter Citation (SCC): *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 S.C.C. 51 (India).

Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, [2025] INSC 909 (India), available at

https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0362dad6e273d32235ae02b7d32157/uploads/2026/01/202_6013186.pdf.

Satender Kumar Antil Case Presentation, Jharkhand Judicial Acad. (July 2025), <https://jajharkhand.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Antil-case-ppt.pdf>.

ANALYSIS OF THE JUDGEMENT

The intention of the court behind this judgement was to clarify the broadening of the concept and scope of bail and to resolve all the doubts which were likely to arise while granting the bail. While safeguards against arbitrary arrests theoretically exist, they fall short in protecting vulnerable sections. Ambiguous justifications for arrests disproportionately target migrants and the socioeconomically disadvantaged. The current bail system operates on flawed assumptions of wealth and social capital, rendering 'bail not jail' meaningless for many undertrials. Reform efforts must challenge these presumptions and prioritize equity and access to justice for all. Structural barriers, from financial constraints to navigating legal complexities, hinder undertrials' ability to meet bail conditions.

CONCLUSION

Bail reform is urgent, but it must be rooted in empirical understanding and systemic overhaul. Develop diversion programs that offer counseling, community service, or restorative justice practices as alternatives to bail. Allow judges greater discretion in setting bail conditions tailored to the individual circumstances of each case. It is notable for the courts to adhere to the guidelines given by SC in Satendra Kumar Antil Case along with other landmark judgments related to bail.

Standard Print Reporter Citation (SCC): *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 S.C.C. 51 (India).

Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, [2025] INSC 909 (India), available at

https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0362dad6e273d32235ae02b7d32157/uploads/2026/01/202_6013186.pdf.

Satender Kumar Antil Case Presentation, Jharkhand Judicial Acad. (July 2025), <https://jajharkhand.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Antil-case-ppt.pdf>.

