

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14906-2023 (O&M)
Date of order: 13.07.2023

Avtar Singh @ Tari
... Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab
...Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. Gurinder Singh Lali, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
133	15.09.2020	Dhanaula, District Barnala	21, 22 and 25 NDPS Act

1. The petitioner incarcerated for violating the above-mentioned provisions of Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act) per the FIR captioned above, on the allegations of possession of 1050 tablets of Tramadol, has come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.
2. In paragraph 11 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.
3. Petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and is also voluntarily agreeable to the condition that till the conclusion of the trial before the trial Court, the petitioner shall keep only one mobile number, which is mentioned in AADHAR card, and within fifteen days of release from prison undertakes to disconnect all other mobile numbers. The petitioner contends that the further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.
4. While opposing the bail, the contention on behalf of the State is that the quantity of contraband involved in the case falls in the commercial category.

REASONING:

6. As per the status report, the petitioner's total custody is more than 2 years and 9 months. The petitioner indisputably has no criminal antecedents and has already complete pre-trial custody exceeding two years and six months. Thus, he is entitled to bail based on **Dheeraj Kumar Shukla v. The State of Uttar Pradesh** [SLP (Crl) 6690-2022], decided on 25 Jan 2023. The judgment in **Dheeraj Shukla's** case (*supra*) would be attracted only when the three conditions are fulfilled,

- (a). The custody of more than 2 years and 6 months and the delay was not attributable to accused.
- (b). Trial is at an initial stage.
- (c) The petitioner is the first offender.

7. The petitioner fulfills all the three conditions and thus, section 37 of NDPS Act would not be attracted. The possibility of the accused influencing the investigation, tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses, and the likelihood of fleeing justice, can be taken care of by imposing elaborative and stringent conditions. In **Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi)**, 2020:INSC:106 [Para 92], (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions.

8. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail, subject to the following terms and conditions, which shall be over and above and irrespective of the contents of the form of bail bonds in chapter XXXIII of CrPC, 1973.

9. In **Madhu Tanwar and Anr. v. State of Punjab**, 2023:PHHC:077618 [Para 10, 21], CRM-M-27097-2023, decided on 29-05-2023, this Court observed,

[10] The exponential growth in technology and artificial intelligence has transformed identification techniques remarkably. Voice, gait, and facial recognition are incredibly sophisticated and pervasive. Impersonation, as we know it traditionally, has virtually become impossible. Thus, the remedy lies that whenever a judge or an officer believes that the accused might be a flight risk or has a history of fleeing from justice, then in such cases, appropriate conditions can be inserted that all the expenditure that shall be incurred to trace them, shall be recovered from such person, and the State shall have a lien over their assets to make good the loss.

[21] In this era when the knowledge revolution has just begun, to keep pace with exponential and unimaginable changes the technology has brought to human lives, it is only fitting that the

dependence of the accused on surety is minimized by giving alternative options. Furthermore, there should be no insistence to provide permanent addresses when people either do not have permanent abodes or intend to re-locate.

10. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, he shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, in the following terms:

(a). Petitioner to furnish personal bond of Rs. Ten thousand (INR 10,000/-); AND

(b) To give one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the concerned court, and in case of non-availability, to any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned officer/court must satisfy that if the accused fails to appear in court, then such surety can produce the accused before the court.

OR

(b). Petitioner to hand over to the concerned court a fixed deposit for Rs. Ten thousand only (INR 10,000/-), with the clause of automatic renewal of the principal and the interest reverting to the linked account, made in favor of the 'Chief Judicial Magistrate' of the concerned district, or blocking the aforesaid amount in favour of the concerned 'Chief Judicial Magistrate'. Said fixed deposit or blocking funds can be from any of the banks where the stake of the State is more than 50% or from any of the well-established and stable private sector banks. In case the bankers are not willing to make a Fixed Deposit in such eventuality it shall be permissible for the petitioner to prepare an account payee demand draft favouring concerned Chief Judicial Magistrate for the similar amount.

(c). Such Court shall have a lien over the funds until the case's closure or discharged by substitution, or up to the expiry of the period mentioned under S. 437-A CrPC, 1973, and at that stage, subject to the proceedings under S. 446 CrPC, the entire amount of fixed deposit, less taxes if any, shall be endorsed/returned to the depositor.

(d). The petitioner is to also execute a bond for attendance in the concerned court(s) as and when asked to do so. The presentation of the personal bond shall be deemed acceptance of the declarations made in the bail petition and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and of this bail order.

(e). While furnishing personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number [In case of the residents of India]	
2.	Passport number [In case of foreign nationals]	
3.	Passport number of an Indian citizen, (If available), when the attesting officer/court deems appropriate or considers the accused as a flight risk.	
4.	Mobile number (If available)	
5.	E-Mail id (If available)	

11. The petitioner shall not influence, browbeat, pressurize, make any inducement, threat, or promise, directly or indirectly, to the witnesses, the police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and the circumstances of the case, to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the police, or the court, or to tamper with the evidence.

12. Within fifteen days of release from prison, the petitioner shall procure a smartphone and inform its IMEI number and other details to the SHO/I.O. of the Police station mentioned above. The petitioner shall always keep the phone location/GPS on the “ON” mode. Whenever the Investigating officer asks to share the location, the petitioner shall immediately do so. The petitioner shall neither clear the location history, WhatsApp chats, call logs nor format the phone without permission of the concerned SHO/I.O. This condition shall continue till the completion of the trial or closure of case, whichever is earlier. Petitioner is further directed to comply with their undertaking as reflected in the beginning of this order and also directed not to obtain more than one mobile number till the conclusion of trial. ***If the petitioner fails to comply with this condition, then on this ground alone, the bail might be canceled, and the complainant may file any such application for the cancellation of bail, and the State shall file the said application.***

13. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days from release from prison and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case

of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules.

14. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioner repeats or commits any offence where the sentence prescribed is more than seven years or violates any condition as stipulated in this order, it shall always be permissible to the respondent to apply for cancellation of this bail. It shall further be open for any investigating agency to bring it to the notice of the court seized of the subsequent application that the accused was earlier cautioned not to indulge in criminal activities. Otherwise, the bail bonds shall remain in force throughout the trial and after that in Section 437-A of the Cr.P.C., if not canceled due to non-appearance or breach of conditions.

15. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavour that the accused does not repeat the offence and to ensure the safety of the society. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, **2022:INSC:735 [Para 28]**, Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

16. Any Advocate for the petitioner and the Officer in whose presence the petitioner puts signatures on personal bonds shall explain all conditions of this bail order in any language that the petitioner understands.

17. If the petitioner finds bond amount beyond social and financial reach, it may be brought to the notice of this Court for appropriate reduction. Further, if the petitioner finds bail condition(s) as violating fundamental, human, or other rights, or causing difficulty due to any situation, then for modification of such term(s), the petitioner may file a reasoned application before this Court, and after taking cognizance, even to the Court taking cognizance or the trial Court, as the case may be, and such Court shall also be competent to modify or delete any condition.

18. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the merits of the case nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

19. In return for the protection from incarceration, the Court believes that the accused shall also reciprocate through desirable behavior.

20. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order for furnishing bonds, and*

any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. In case the attesting officer wants to verify the authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

Petition allowed in aforesaid terms. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

July 13, 2023
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No