

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-3684-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision:15.03.2018

Shakti

... Petitioner

Vs.

U.T. Chandigarh

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Dutt, APP, U.T., Chandigarh.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL).

Petitioner seeks benefit of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No.94, dated 10.06.2017, under Section 21/22 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Maloya, District Chandigarh.

As per prosecution version, the alleged recovery effected from the petitioner was of 15 injections of Bupranorphine and 15 injections of Pheniramine Meleate.

Petitioner was arrested on 10.06.2017. it has gone uncontroverted that the petitioner was granted interim bail to await the report of Chemical Examiner.

Petitioner is not stated to have misused such concession.

Trial is at the initial stage and would take time to conclude.

During the course of arguments, counsel has adverted to an order dated 06.10.2017, passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-30008 of 2017, wherein the benefit of bail was granted to the

petitioner, therein, namely Sonu and against whom, there was an alleged recovery of 24 injections of Rexogesic containing 2 ml. each and containing the salt of Bupranorphine Hydrochloride.

The order dated 06.10.2017 in CRM-M-30008 of 2017 reads as follows:-

“This petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.86 dated 24.04.2017, registered under Sections 22, 61, 85 NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Basti Bawa Khel, District Jalandhar.

According to the case spelled out in the FIR, the petitioner was apprehended while carrying one green colour bag in his right hand. The search revealed that the bag contained 24 injections of “Avillomc” and 24 injections of “Rexogesic” containing 2 ml each. The injections were seized and the petitioner was taken into custody on 24.04.2017. Since then, the petitioner has been in jail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that according to the report of the FSL “Avillomc” is a nonpsychotropic substance whereas “Rexogesic” contains the salt “Buprenorphine Hydrochloride” and each injection contains 0.324 mg of the said substance and in totality 24 injections contain 15.55 mg of the alleged contraband. Thus, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the quantity recovered from the petitioner is less than the commercial quantity.

Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that according to the FSL report, 0.25 mg of psychotropic substance is contained in every ml of the sample. Taking the same into consideration, the total content of the psychotropic substance in 24 injections of 2 ml each works out to be 12 mg. Apart from that learned State counsel relies upon Note (iv) inserted vide amendment dated 18.11.2009 in Notification

dated 19.10.2001 appended with the NDPS Act, 1985 to submit that the quantity mentioned as non-commercial/commercial in the said Notification is to be taken with reference to the entire quantity of the contraband, recovered and not on the basis of the pure drug content.

Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the first proviso to Rule 66(ii) of NDPS Rules, 1985, to submit that a person is lawfully authorised to possess 100 doses unit at a time. He relies upon a judgment of Division Bench in Saleem Mohd. vs. State of Punjab, 2015(5) Law Herald 3939.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that whether the possession of the alleged psychotropic substance falls within commercial quantity or not, is to be decided at the time of trial. The first proviso to Rule 66 (ii) of NDPS Rule, 1985, favours the petitioner provided he is able to show at the time of trial that the possession of the substance, was for medicinal use. Further, "Avillomc" has been proven to be a non- psychotropic substance.

Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances and the fact that the petitioner has been in custody since 24.04.2017, I deem it just and expedient to release the petitioner on bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Judge, Special Court under the NDPS Act, 1985, District Jalandhar.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly."

Learned State counsel concedes that the petitioner is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act.

Petitioner is held entitled to the benefit of bail in terms of the reasoning adopted in order dated 06.10.2017, passed by the Co-ordinate Bench in CRM-M-30008 of 2017.

Petition is allowed.

Without making any observations on merits, petitioner is held

entitled to the benefit of bail.

Petitioner be enlarged on bail subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

Disposed of.

15.03.2018

harjeet

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |