

21

\$~R-1 to 3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 643/2012 & CrI.M.A.No. 2241/2014**

MANOHAR LAL & ORS. Petitioners
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narang, Advocate

versus

STATE TH. PFA, GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI Respondent
Through: Mr. Navin Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State

+ **CRL.M.C. 644/2012 & CrI.M.A.No. 2243/2012**

VIJAY KUMAR BAHAL & ORS. Petitioners
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narang, Advocate

versus

STATE Respondent
Through: Mr. Navin Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State

+ **CRL.M.C. 645/2012 & CrI.M.A.No. 2245/2012**

DHARAMPAL KUMAR & ORS. Petitioners
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narang, Advocate

versus

STATE THR. FOOD INSPECTOR Respondent
Through: Mr. Navin Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State

22

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
28.07.2015

%

In the above-captioned three petitions, quashing of complaint cases No.256/PFA/DA/06, No.255/PFA/DA/06 & No.249/PFA/DA/06 for the offence under Section 7 & 16 of *Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954* is sought while relying upon decision of a Coordinate Bench of this Court in Crl.M.C.No.1047/2008 titled *M/s Bunge India Private Limited & Anr. v. The State & Anr.* rendered on 20th January, 2011.

With the consent of both the sides, these three petitions were heard together as quashing of the complaints in question is sought on identical grounds i.e. while placing reliance on the afore-cited decision and are being disposed of by this common order.

At the hearing, learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioners are wholesalers-cum-suppliers of *Dalda Vanaspati* and it is submitted that *M/s Bunge India Private Limited* is the manufacturer of the *Dalda Vanaspati*, which is said to be misbranded. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that once the complaints in question already stand quashed qua manufacturer i.e. *M/s Bunge India Private Limited* then there remains no justification to continue the proceedings against petitioners in the complaints in question.

Mr. Navin Sharma, Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that the case of petitioners is in fact covered by the afore-cited decision.

Finding the case of petitioners to be covered by the decision in *M/s*

23

Bunge India Private Limited (supra), these three petitions are allowed and complaint cases No. 256/PFA/DA/06, No.255/PFA/DA/06 & No.249/PFA/DA/06 for the offence under Section 7 & 16 of *Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954* are quashed qua petitioners as well.

The petitions and applications are accordingly disposed of.



(SUNIL GAUR)
Judge

JULY 28, 2015
vn