

\$~32

*** IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Judgment delivered on: 23.05.2018

+ BAIL APPLN. 567/2018

RADHA

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr.R,K.Bachan, Advocate.

For the Respondent : Mr.G.M.Farooqui, APP for the State.
SI Jasmer Singh, PS Jahangir Puri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

23.05.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.600/2017 under Sections 20/61/85 of the Narcotic Drugs And Psychotropic Act, 1985 and Sections 33/38 of the Delhi Excise Act.
2. Petitioner is alleged to be a bootlegger and was allegedly found in possession illicit liquor and *Ganja* weighing 1 kg and 670 gm (commercial quantity being 20 kg.)
3. Petitioner has been in custody since 11.12.2017 having availed

interim bail on three occasions for one week, ten days and one week respectively. Petitioner had already spent 3 months and 26 days in custody as on 23.04.2018.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated. He also disputes the very involvement and disputes the seizure and arrest.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the alleged raid was conducted on 10.12.2017 at 2.25 PM and petitioner was allegedly found in possession of liquor and *Ganja* and selling the same. He submits that there is a discrepancy in the FIR as the petitioner was not arrested on 10.12.2017 but was subsequently arrested on 11.12.2017 after being called to the Police Station.

6. Status report has been filed which states that the petitioner has been involved in 14 other FIRs from 2000 to 2007 in identical offences.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in all those FIRs and as per his instructions, the petitioner has been acquitted in all those FIRs and admittedly, since the year 2007 till the subject FIR was lodged against him, the petitioner was not involved in any case. He further submits that the petitioner was earlier enlarged on interim bail and did not misuse the liberty granted and surrendered after the period was over.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case, perusal of the record shows that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on her furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case.

9. The petitioner shall not do anything, which may either prejudice the trial or the prosecution witnesses. Petition is disposed of.

10. Order Dasti under signatures of Court Master.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 23, 2018

'Sn'