

635 Criminal Appeal No. D-12-DB of 2011 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.12.2018

... Appellant

State of Punjab

... Respondent

Jaswinder Singh

... Appellant

State of Punjab

... Respondent

Present : Mr.B.S.Kathuria, Advocate for the appellant
in CRA-D-12-DB-2011.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, Advocate for the appellant
in CRA-D-786-DB-2011.

Mr. H.S.Grewal, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.

By this common judgment, two criminal appeals viz. Criminal Appeal No. D-12-DB of 2011 and Criminal Appeal No.D-786-DB-2011 are being disposed of as they involve similar questions of law and facts.

FACTS

The present appeals have been preferred by the appellants-accused challenging their conviction and sentence under Section 15 of

Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'Act').

As per the prosecution story, SI/SHO Sukhpal Singh (PW-8) along with other police personnel were at a naka where SI/SHO received a secret information that a truck containing poppy husk would arrive. It was about 8.00 am. On the basis of suspicion, truck was signalled and stopped. The driver disclosed his name as Jaswinder Singh son of Karnail Singh. The other accused Gurnam Singh @ Gama was sitting on the bags stacked in the cargo portion of the Truck.

To conduct the search Gazetted Officer i.e. Kulwant Singh, DSP (Traffic) (PW-4) was called and in his presence search was conducted. In total, 20 bags containing 36.250 kgs of poppy husk were found loaded in the truck.

In the impugned judgment under challenge, the informant/complainant himself is the Investigating Officer.

ARGUMENTS

Learned counsels for the appellants have contended that impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence are liable to be set aside being against law and facts. It has been contended by learned counsel for the appellant that after introducing the independent witness Satpal, he was not examined by the prosecution. Moreover, the owner of the truck namely Jagiro wife of Swarna Ram was not produced before the trial court by the prosecution. It was further contended by learned counsel for the appellants that even the truck was not produced during the trial. Learned counsels have further stressed on the fact that the Investigating Officer namely Sukhpal Singh (PW-8) himself is an informant/complainant which itself is against the settled canons of law.

Per contra, learned State counsel has supported the impugned judgment and order of sentence. It has been pointed out that non-examination of independent witness does not cause any prejudice to the accused. The official testimonies inspire confidence and testimonies of the recovery witness ASI Bikram Singh (PW-5) and Investigation Officer-SI Sukhpal Singh (PW-8) reveals that the recovery was effected and proper procedure was adopted as per the Act.

CONSIDERATION

We have heard learned counsels for the parties and have gone through the record. The primary question for consideration is whether in a criminal prosecution, it will be in consonance with the principles of justice, fair play and a fair investigation, if the informant and the Investigating Officer is the same person. In such a case, it is necessary for the accused to demonstrate prejudice, especially under laws specially NDPS Act carrying a reverse burden of proof.

The Special Court, Jalandhar while passing the impugned judgment has drawn a conclusion that it is a case of poor investigation of non-joinder of owner of the truck, non-production of truck at the time of trial and non-producing owner of the Truck namely Jagiro and above all the role of above said truck owner was not proved as required under Section 25 of the Act.

As per the admitted fact, informant/complainant is the Investigating Officer in both the appeals. This question has been answered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Criminal Appeal No.1880 of 2011** titled '**Mohan Lal vs. The State of Punjab**', decided on 16.08.2018, wherein, while placing reliance on judgments delivered in cases : **State of Punjab vs.**

Baldev Singh, (1999) 6 SCC 172, Megha Singh vs. State of Haryana, (1996) 11 SCC 709, State by Inspector of Police, Narcotics Intelligence Bureau, Madurai, Tamilnadu vs. Rajangam, (2010) 15 SCC 369 and Bhaskar Ramappa Madar & others vs. State of Karnataka, (2009) 11 SCC 690, it has been observed as under:-

“14. In a criminal prosecution, there is an obligation cast on the investigator not only to be fair, judicious and just during investigation, but also that the investigation on the very face of it must appear to be so, eschewing any conduct or impression which may give rise to a real and genuine apprehension in the mind of an accused and not mere fanciful, that the investigation was not fair. In the circumstances, if an informant police official in a criminal prosecution, especially when carrying a reverse burden of proof, makes the allegations, is himself asked to investigate, serious doubts will naturally arise with regard to his fairness and impartiality. It is not necessary that bias must actually be proved. It would be illogical to presume and contrary to normal human conduct, that he would himself at the end of the investigation submit a closure report to conclude false implication with all its attendant consequences for the complainant himself. The result of the investigation would therefore be a foregone conclusion.

15. The discussion in the present case may not be understood as confined to the requirements of a fair investigation under the NDPS Act only carrying a reverse burden of proof. **Baldev Singh** (supra) related to a prosecution under Section 165A of the IPC. Nonetheless, it observed that if the informant were to be made the investigating officer, it was bound to reflect on the credibility of the prosecution case. **Megha Singh** (supra) concerned a prosecution under the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1985. It was held that the Head Constable being the complainant himself could not have proceeded with the investigation and it was a practice, to say the least, which should not be resorted to so that there may not be any occasion to suspect fair and impartial investigation. **Rajangam** (supra) was a prosecution under the NDPS Act, an objection was taken that PW-6 who apprehended the accused could not have investigated the case. Upholding the objection, relying on **Megha Singh** (supra) the accused was acquitted. The view taken by the Madras High Court in **Balasundaran vs. State**, 1999 (113) ELT 785 (Mad.), was also noticed as follows:

“16. Learned Counsel for the appellants also stated that P.W. 5 being the Inspector of Police who was present at the time of search and he was the investigating officer and as such it is fatal to the case of the prosecution. P.W. 5 according to the prosecution, was present with PWs 3 and

4 at the time of search. In fact, P.W. 5 alone took up investigation in the case and he had examined the witnesses. No doubt the successor to P.W. 5 alone had filed the charge sheet. But there is no material to show that he had examined any other witness. It therefore follows that P.W. 5 was the person who really investigated the case. P.W. 5 was the person who had searched the appellants in question and he being the investigation officer, certainly it is not proper and correct. The investigation ought to have been done by any other investigating agency. On this score also, the investigation is bound to suffer and as such the entire proceedings will be vitiated.”

16. **Bhaskar Ramappa Madar** (supra) concerned a prosecution under Section 304B, I.P.C. which also carried a reverse burden of proof. The Trial Court held that the investigating Officer who was also the complainant could not have investigated, and on that ground, held the prosecution to be tainted. The acquittal was reversed by the High Court. In appeal, this Court declined to interfere with the conviction. After referring to **Bhagwan Singh** (supra) and **Megha Singh** (supra), it was observed that the principles laid down therein had to be confined to the facts of the said case and that the matter would have to be decided on the facts of each case without any universal generalization.

17. **Hardip Singh vs. State of Punjab**, 2008 (8) SCC 557 concerned a prosecution under the NDPS Ac. The contention was that the Inspector, PW-5 being the complainant himself would be an interested person and should not have been made the investigation officer. The argument was repelled relying on **State rep. by Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu V. Jayapaul**, 2004 (5) SCC 223 observing as follows:

“6.... We find no principle or binding authority to hold that the moment the competent police officer, on the basis of information received, makes out an FIR incorporating his name as the informant, he forfeits his right to investigate. If at all, such investigation could only be assailed on the ground of bias or real likelihood of bias on the part of the investigating officer. The question of bias would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and it is not proper to lay down a broad and unqualified proposition, in the manner in which it has been done by the High Court, that whenever a police officer proceeds to investigate after registering the FIR on his own, the investigation would necessarily be unfair or biased.”

In the present case, in two FIRs, informant/complainant himself is the investigating officer. Keeping in view the aforementioned law

laid down on this question, in our opinion, to leave the matter for being determined on the individual facts of a case, may not only lead to a possible abuse of powers, but more importantly will leave the police, the accused, the lawyers and the courts in a state of uncertainty and confusion which has to be avoided. It is therefore held that a fair investigation, which is the very foundation of fair trial, necessarily postulates that the informant and the investigator must not be the same person. The investigation ought to have been done by another person/investigating agency otherwise investigation would necessarily be unfair/biased. Justice must not only be done, but it must also appear to be done. Any possibility of bias or a predetermined conclusion has to be excluded. This requirement is all the more imperative in laws carrying a reverse burden of proof. Resultantly, the prosecution is held to be vitiated because of the infraction of the constitutional guarantee of a fair investigation.

Order

- i) Criminal Appeal No. D-12-DB of 2011 and Criminal Appeal No.D-786-DB-2011 are allowed.
- ii) Impugned judgment of convictions and orders of sentence dated 11.12.2010 passed by Judge Special Court, Jalandhar are set aside and appellants are acquitted of the charges for which they have been convicted.
- iii) The appellants be released forthwith if not required in any other crime.

**(A.B.CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE**

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

11.12.2018
pooja saini

Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No