



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.06.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. SIVAGNANAM

Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

Ajith

.. Petitioner

Vs

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-9, Thazhambur Police Station,
Chennai – 600 130.
Crime No.87/2022.

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 397 r/w.401 Cr.P.C. to call for the the records and papers relating to Crl.M.P.No.5635 of 2022 on the file of the Principal Special Judge, Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai and set aside the order dated 19.12.2022.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.G.Martin manivannan

For Respondent : Mr.R.Vinothraja,
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision case has been filed challenging the order of dismissal of statutory bail petition, dated 19.12.2022 passed by the Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai.



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

WEB COPY

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioner along with other accused persons in Crime No.87 of 2022 for the offence under Sections 8 [c] read with 20 [b] [ii] [c] of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 for illegal possession of 42.500 Kgs of Ganja, Nitrovet 10 Mg-600 Nos of Tablets and Tydol 100 Mg-800 Nos. of Tablets. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.04.2022. The learned counsel further submitted that since the respondent Police has not filed final report within statutory period of 180 days, the petitioner/accused filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.5635 of 2022, 09.11.2022 for statutory bail. The prosecution has filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022 under Section 36 [A] [4] of NDPS Act before 180 days for extension of statutory period to complete the investigation. Though the statutory bail application filed on 09.11.2022 the learned Judge without passing any order in the statutory bail application, decided only the extension application filed by the prosecution in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022 and dismissed Crl.M.P.No.5635 of 2022 on 19.12.2022 which is contrary to the principles laid down by



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

the Honourable Supreme Court in **Sanjay Dutt. Vs. State through B.I, Bombay (II) (1994(5) SCC page 410).**

3. It is further submitted that the final report has been filed by the respondent Police on 23.12.2022. Thereafter dismissed the extension application filed by the prosecution in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022 on 25.01.2023 for the reasons that the final report has been filed Which exposes that on the date of dismissal of the statutory application, no final report has been filed and extension application has not been decided. This action of the learned Judge is against the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court cited supra.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that the accused was arrested on 02.04.2022. Admittedly, the respondent Police filed extension application in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022, it was undecided at the time of disposing bail application on 19.12.2022. The final report in this case has been filed on 23.12.2022. The case has been taken on file in C.C.No.176 of 2022 and hence the learned Judge dismissed the



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

WEB COPY

extension application in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022 on 25.01.2023 for the reasons that final report has been filed.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. On a perusal of records, it is seen that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioner along with other accused persons in Crime No.87 of 2022 for the offence under Sections 8 [c] read with 20 [b] [ii] [c] of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 for illegal possession of 42.500 Kgs of Ganja, Nitrovet 10 Mg-600 Nos of Tablets and Tydol 100 Mg-800 Nos. of Tablets, pursuant to which the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.04.2022. Thereafter the respondent Police did not file any final report within the statutory period of 180 days and hence the petitioner/accused filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.5635 of 2022, 09.11.2022 for statutory bail. The prosecution has filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022 under Section 36 [A] [4] of NDPS Act before 180 days for extension of



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

statutory period to complete the investigation. Though the statutory bail application filed on 09.11.2022, the learned Judge without considering the same, taking into account of the extension application filed by the prosecution, dismissed Crl.M.P.No.5635 of 2022 on 19.12.2022. The decision of the learned Judge is contrary to the principles laid down by the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Sanjay Dutt. Vs. State through B.I, Bombay (II)*** reported in ***(1994(5) SCC page 410)***.

7. It is not in disputed that the accused is under custody from 02.04.2022. It is also not disputed that the final report has not been filed within the statutory period. Apart from these facts, the petition filed by the respondent Police for extension of investigation in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022 was not decided at the time of disposing the statutory bail application on 19.12.2022. At this juncture, it is relevant to refer the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Judgebir Singh @ Jasbir singh Samra @ Jasbir & Ors. Vrs. National Investigation Agency*** in ***Criminal Appeal No. 1012 of 2023*** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court granted statutory bail in favour of the petitioner by setting aside the



impugned order. The relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder for better appreciation:

76. As is evident from the chronology of dates and events referred to in the earlier part of our judgment, the final report under Section 173(2) of the CrPC was filed in the Court of SDJM, Ajnala on 15.11.2019. 15.11.2019 was the 161st day from the date of arrest of two of the appellants before us, namely, Jasbir Singh and Varinder Singh. They were the first to be arrested on 08.06.2019. The Punjab Police applied to the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, for extension of time to complete the investigation invoking the proviso to Section 43D(2)(b) of the UAPA on 04.09.2019. When this application for extension of time was filed only two days were left for 90 days to expire. This is suggestive of the fact that the 91st day would have fallen on 07.09.2019. What is important to highlight is that the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, looked into the extension application dated 04.09.2019 filed by the Punjab Police and ultimately, extended the time limit vide its order dated 17.09.2019 i.e., on the 101st day. By the time, the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, passed an order extending the time, the period of 90 days had already



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

expired. Indisputably, there was no chargesheet before the Court on the 91st day i.e., on 07.09.2019. The reason why we say that this is a grey area is because what would have happened if the appellants Jasbir Singh and Varinder Singh had preferred an application seeking statutory/default bail under Section 167(2) of the CrPC on the 91st day i.e., on 07.09.2019. The application seeking extension of time was very much pending. The Additional Sessions Judge could not have even allowed such application promptly i.e., on or before the 90th day without giving notice to the accused persons. The law is now well settled in view of the decision of this Court in the case of Jigar alias Jimmy Pravinchandra Aditya v. State of Gujarat reported in 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1290 that an opportunity of hearing has to be given to the accused persons before the time is extended up to 180 days to complete the investigation. The only error or lapse on the part of the appellants Jasbir and Varinder Singh was that they failed to prefer an appropriate application seeking statutory/default bail on the 91st day. If such application would have been filed, the court would have had no option but to release them on statutory/default bail. The Court could not have said that since the extension application was pending, it shall pass



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

an appropriate order only after the extension application was decided. That again would have been something contrary to the well settled position of law. This litigation is an eye opener for the NIA as well as the State investigating agency that if they want to seek extension, they must be careful that such extension is not prayed for at the last moment.

77. The right to be released on default bail continues to remain enforceable if the accused has applied for such bail, notwithstanding pendency of the bail application or subsequent filing of the chargesheet or a report seeking extension of time by the prosecution before the court. However, where the accused fails to apply for default bail when the right accrues to him, and subsequently a chargesheet, or a report seeking extension of time is preferred before the Magistrate or any other competent court, the right to default bail would be extinguished. The court would be at liberty to take cognizance of the case or grant further time for completion of the investigation, as the case may be, though the accused may still be released on bail under other provisions of the CrPC.

78. Our observations in paras 76 and 77 respectively as above are keeping in mind the decision of



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

this Court rendered by a three-Judge Bench in the case of Sayed Mohd. Ahmad Kazmi v. State (Government of NCT of Delhi) and Others reported in (2012) 12 SCC 1, wherein in paras 25, 26 and 27 respectively, this Court observed as under:

“25. Having carefully considered the submissions made on behalf of the respective parties, the relevant provisions of law and the decision cited, we are unable to accept the submissions advanced on behalf of the State by the learned Additional Solicitor General Mr Raval. There is no denying the fact that on 17-7-2012, when CR No. 86 of 2012 was allowed by the Additional Sessions Judge and the custody of the appellant was held to be illegal and an application under Section 167(2) CrPC was made on behalf of the appellant for grant of statutory bail which was listed for hearing. Instead of hearing the application, the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate adjourned the same till the next day when the Public Prosecutor filed an application for extension of the period of custody and investigation and on 20-7- 2012 extended the time of investigation and the



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

custody of the appellant for a further period of 90 days with retrospective effect from 2-6-2012. Not only is the retrospectivity of the order of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate untenable, it could not also defeat the statutory right which had accrued to the appellant on the expiry of 90 days from the date when the appellant was taken into custody. Such right, as has been commented upon by this Court in Sanjay Dutt [(1994) 5 SCC 410 : 1994 SCC (Cri) 1433] and the other cases cited by the learned Additional Solicitor General, could only be distinguished (sic extinguished) once the charge-sheet had been filed in the case and no application has been made prior thereto for grant of statutory bail. It is well-established that if an accused does not exercise his right to grant of statutory bail before the charge-sheet is filed, he loses his right to such benefit once such charge-sheet is filed and can, thereafter, only apply for regular bail. 26. The circumstances in this case, however, are different in that the appellant had exercised his right to statutory bail on the very same day on which his custody was held to be



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

illegal and such an application was left undecided by the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate till after the application filed by the prosecution for extension of time to complete investigation was taken up and orders were passed thereupon. 27. We are unable to appreciate the procedure adopted by the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, which has been endorsed by the High Court and we are of the view that the appellant acquired the right for grant of statutory bail on 17-7-2012, when his custody was held to be illegal by the Additional Sessions Judge since his application for statutory bail was pending at the time when the application for extension of time for continuing the investigation was filed by the prosecution. In our view, the right of the appellant to grant of statutory bail remained unaffected by the subsequent application and both the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate and the High Court erred in holding otherwise.”



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

WEB COPY

8. Reverting back to the facts of this case, it is not disputed that the respondent Police filed final report on 23.12.2022; the impugned order of dismissing the statutory bail application is on 19.12.2022; the application for extension of investigation filed by the prosecution in Crl.M.P.No.4708 of 2022 was dismissed on 25.01.2023 for the reason that final report has been taken on file in C.C.No.176 of 2023. The above dates of events exposes the facts that on the date of dismissing the statutory application no final report was filed by the respondent Police as well as the extension of investigation is not granted by the Court. Hence, the decision of the learned Judge is unsustainable and the same a complete violation of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Judgebir Singh @ Jasbir singh Samra @ Jasbir & Ors. Vrs. National Investigation Agency*** in ***Criminal Appeal No. 1012 of 2023*** as mentioned supra. Therefore, the impugned order passed by the trial judge is liable to be set aside.

9. In view of the foregoing discussions, the impugned order dated 19.12.2022 passed in Crl.M.P.No.5635 of 2022 by the learned Principal



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

Special Judge, Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai, is set aside and Statutory Bail is granted to the petitioner and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) along with two sureties each for a like sum, before the I Additional Special Judge, NDPS Act, Chennai on the following conditions:

- (a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Court concerned may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;
- (b) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;
- (c) the petitioner to appear before the respondent police on the first working day of every month at 10.30 a.m., until further orders;
- (d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;
- (e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court
in *P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*;
and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can
be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

10. With the above directions, this Criminal Revision Case is
allowed.

22.06.2023

vum

Index: yes/no

Internet:yes/no

To

1. The Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai.
2. The I Additional Special Court, NDPS Act, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
D-1, Thiruthani Police Station,
Thiruthani – 631 209.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

V. SIVAGNANAM, J.

vum

Crl.R.C.No.924 of 2023

22.06.2023