



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.19313 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.08.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.OP.No. 19313 of 2023

Roselin

....Petitioner/Accused-3

Vs

The State rep. by
Inspector of Police,
Tiruppur North Police Station,
Tiruppur City
(Crime No.1528 of 2019)

....Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail concerned in C.C.No.38 of 2020 on the file of the Principal NDPS Court, Coimbatore in Crime No.1528 of 2019, Tiruppur North Police Station, Tiruppur District.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Jayaprakash

For Respondent : Mr.R.Murthy
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 31.12.2019 for the alleged offences punishable under **Sections 8(c) r/w**



Crl.OP.No.19313 of 2023

20(b)(ii)(c) and 25 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances

Act and later altered to **Sections 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(C), 25 and 29(1) of the NDPS Act**, pending trial in C.C.No.38 of 2020 in respect of Crime No.1528 of 2019 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with other accused were found in possession of 51 Kgs of Ganja. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that a false case has been foisted as against the petitioner and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that she is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed on her. He also submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody from 31.12.2019 and the co-accused were already granted bail by this Court. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the State submitted that the petitioner along with other accused were found in



Crl.OP.No.19313 of 2023

possession of 51 Kgs of Ganja. He further submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would tamper the witnesses and hamper the evidence. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. It is seen that there are totally three accused, in which the petitioner is arrayed as A3. According to the petitioner, the petitioner was a pillion rider of the bike, in which the petitioner was found in possession of Ganja weighing 26 Kgs. The other accused were found in possession of 25 Kgs of contraband. That apart, A1 and A2 were already granted bail by this Court. Therefore, following the rule of parity and also delay in completion of trial, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. In this regard, it is relevant to extract the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India reported in **2023 LiveLaw (SC) 260** in the case of **Mohd Muslim @ Hussain Vs State (NCT of Delhi)**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held as follows:-

“ 18. The conditions which courts have to be cognizant of are that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is “not guilty of such offence” and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. What is meant by “not guilty” when all the evidence is not before the court? It can only be a prima facie determination. That places the court’s discretion within a very narrow margin. Given the mandate of the general



WEB COPY

law on bails (Sections 436, 437 and 439, CrPC) which classify offences based on their gravity, and instruct that certain serious crimes have to be dealt with differently while considering bail applications, the additional condition that the court should be satisfied that the accused (who is in law presumed to be innocent) is not guilty, has to be interpreted reasonably. Further the classification of offences under Special Acts (NDPS Act, etc.), which apply over and above the ordinary bail conditions required to be assessed by courts, require that the court records its satisfaction that the accused might not be guilty of the offence and that upon release, they are not likely to commit any offence. These two conditions have the effect of overshadowing other conditions. In cases where bail is sought, the court assesses the material on record such as the nature of the offence, likelihood of the accused co-operating with the investigation, not fleeing from justice: even in serious offences like murder, kidnapping, rape, etc. On the other hand, the court in these cases under such special Acts, have to address itself principally on two facts: likely guilt of the accused and the likelihood of them not committing any offence upon release. This court has generally upheld such conditions on the ground that liberty of such citizens have to - in cases when accused of offences enacted under special laws – be balanced against the public interest.

19. A plain and literal interpretation of the conditions under Section 37 (i.e., that Court should be satisfied that the accused is not guilty and would not commit any offence) would effectively exclude grant of bail altogether, resulting in punitive detention and unsanctioned preventive detention as well. Therefore, the only manner in which such special conditions as enacted under Section 37 can be considered within constitutional parameters is where the court is reasonably satisfied on a prima facie look at the material on record (whenever the bail application is made) that the accused is not guilty. Any other interpretation, would result in complete denial of the bail to a person accused of offences such as those enacted under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

20. The standard to be considered therefore, is one, where the court would look at the material in a broad manner, and reasonably see whether the accused's guilt may be proved.



Crl.OP.No.19313 of 2023

WEB COPY

The judgments of this court have, therefore, emphasized that the satisfaction which courts are expected to record, i.e., that the accused may not be guilty, is only prima facie, based on a reasonable reading, which does not call for meticulous examination of the materials collected during investigation (as held in Union of India v. Rattan Malik¹⁹). Grant of bail on ground of undue delay in trial, cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the Act, given the imperative of Section 436A which is applicable to offences under the NDPS Act too (ref. Satender Kumar Antil supra). Having regard to these factors the court is of the opinion that in the facts of this case, the appellant deserves to be enlarged on bail.”

7. Thus, it is clear that grant of bail on ground of undue delay in trial, cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the Act, given the imperative of Section 436A which is applicable to offences under the NDPS Act too.

8. Taking into consideration the facts of the case and the submissions made by the learned counsels and also taking note of the fact that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 31.12.2019, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

9. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with **two blood related sureties**, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the



CrI.OP.No.19313 of 2023

learned **Principal NDPS Court, Coimbatore**, and on further conditions

that:-

[a] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioner shall report before the learned Principal NDPS Court, Coimbatore in C.C.No.38 of 2020, daily at 10.30 a.m. and 5.30 p.m., until further orders ;

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

23.08.2023

Lpp



Crl.OP.No.19313 of 2023

To

1.The Principal NDPS Court, Coimbatore

2.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruppur North Police Station,
Tiruppur City

3.Special Prison for Women, Coimbatore

4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras,
Chennai

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.19313 of 2023

Lpp

CrI.O.P.No.19313 of 2023

23.08.2023