

CRM-M-30461-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-30461-2022
Reserved on: 24.01.2023
Pronounced on: 03.02.2023

Samrat Sabharwal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Virat Rana, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
41	21.05.2021	Division No.4, Jalandhar, Distt. Jalandhar	22 of NDPS Act

1. The petitioner incarcerated for violating the above-mentioned provisions of Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act) as per the FIR captioned above, on the allegations of possessing 3000 tablets of Tramadol in his Chemist shop, without requisite license, has come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.
2. In paragraph 17 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.
3. The petitioner contends that the 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:

5. The quantity allegedly involved in this case is commercial. Given this, the rigours of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case. The burden is on the petitioner to satisfy the twin conditions put in place by the Legislature under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

CRM-M-30461-2022

6. Para 10 of the bail petition reads as follows:

10. That the petitioner submits that the following are the points for consideration of this Hon'ble Court" which clearly reveals that a complete false case of recovery has been planted by the police in revengeful manner.

a. That the petitioner submits, that he was taken into custody at about 04:30 PM on 20.05.2021, whereas the F.I.R. has been recorded after midnight on 21.05.2021, which clearly shows that the false case has been planted, and the petitioner is in custody for last one year 1 month.

b. That the petitioner submits that CCTV footage of the cameras installed on the shops clearly showing the facts that he was brought to the shop at about 08:00 PM, and the shop was got opened by the police officials, keeping the petitioner outside from the shop and in both the CCTV camera showing the time of visit on the camera, and the footage has been preserved by the order of Ld. Lower Court on the prayer of the petitioner.

c. That the petitioner submits that if he was taken into the custody as per the CCTV footage, how the raid has been shown to be conducted as per the police story at about 12:00 PM on 20.05.2021 finding petitioner seating at the shop mentioned in the F.I.R, whereas as per the footage of the CCTV Camera shows that he was brought by the police to the shop, and as per the police shop was opened and raided, so the story of raiding the shop and finding the petitioner seating at the shop is totally false and a false case has been planted, because in that locality there was no occasion to keep the shop open at 12:00 PM on 20.05.2021 without any customer.

d. That the petitioner submits that the police has failed to show the fact that why the two witnesses of locality was not associated while conducting the alleged raid at the shop, which is mandatory as per the section 100 (4) of Cr.P.C, but no conclusive explanation is coming on behalf of the police for this non-compliance, that who was approached at the time of raid.

e. That the petitioner submits that even the compliance of section 41-B of Cr.P.C was also not made by the police, because the petitioner is the local resident of Jalandhar and none of the family member was informed qua his arrest as per record.

f. That the petitioner submits that the version of the police is completely contrary to the available evidence of video recording and at relevant time the location of the medical officer and the concerned police officials were not found on the alleged place of recovery at relevant time, and the relevant inquiry can be made to detect the truth.

g. That the petitioner submits that one year has been passed the trial has not made any headway, and no material witness has been examined, so the petitioner has right to get speedy trial, and he is not required for any investigation and enquiry, and cannot be kept behind bar for the sake of punishment.

7. Para 10 of the reply filed by the concerned Assistant Commissioner of Police, Central Jalandhar, reads as follows:

a. That in reply to contents of this sub-para of the petition it is submitted that petitioner was not taken into custody at 04:30 P.M. on 20-05-2021 and present FIR was rightly registered against petitioner, moreover petitioner has concocted false averments in present para.

b. That in reply to contents contents of this sub-para it is submitted that as per CD recording it is evident that Drug Inspector reached at the shop of petitioner at about 6:52 P.M. and went inside the shop of petitioner and lateron investigating officer reached at the spot and petitioner was not arrested at that time however he was apprehended so that he could not flee away from the said place. It is pertinent to mention here that at 6:52 PM on said date shop of petitioner was opened and upon search of shop of petitioner 3000 tramadol tablets were recovered and present FIR was registered.

c. That contents of this sub-para of the petition are wrong and denied as petitioner has concocted false facts in present para. It is further submitted that FIR was rightly registered against petitioner.

d. That in reply to contents of this sub-para of the petition it is submitted no public witness was found at the place of occurrence as such nobody was joined.

e. That in reply to contents of this sub-para of the petition it is submitted that information of arrest of petitioner was duly provided to his relatives after his arrest.

f. That contents of this sub-para of the petition are wrong and denied.

g. That in reply to contents of this sub-para of the petition it is submitted that recovery of contrabands from petitioner falls under commercial category as such petitioner cannot be enlarged on bail thus present petition is liable to be dismissed.

8. Given the unspecific denials in the reply the petitioner has prima facie satisfied the first condition of section 37 of the NDPS Act to make out a case for bail. Any detailed discussions or observations are likely to prejudice the prosecution's case. Regarding the second rider of S. 37, this court will put very stringent conditions in this order to ensure that the petitioner does not repeat the offence.

9. In *Abida v. State of Haryana*, CRM-M-5077-2022, decided on 13-05-2022, this court observed as follows:

[10]. Thus, both the twin conditions need to be satisfied before a person accused of possessing a commercial quantity of drugs or psychotropic substance is to be released on bail. The first condition is to provide an opportunity to the Public Prosecutor, enabling to take a stand on the bail application. The second stipulation is that the Court must be satisfied that reasonable grounds exist for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence, and is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. If either of these two conditions is not met, the ban on granting bail operates. The expression "reasonable grounds" means something more than prima facie grounds. It contemplates substantial probable causes for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. Even on fulfilling one of the conditions,

the reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such an offence, the Court still cannot give a finding on assurance that the accused is not likely to commit any such crime again. Thus, the grant of bail or denial of bail for possessing commercial quantity would vary from case to case, depending upon its facts.

[30]. From the summary of the law relating to rigors of S.37 of NDPS Act, while granting bail involving commercial quantities, the following fundamental principles emerge:

- (a). In case of inconsistency, S. 37 of the NDPS Act prevails over S. 439 CrPC. [Narcotics Control Bureau v Kishan Lal, 1991 (1) SCC 705, Para 6].
- (b). The limitations on granting of bail come in only when the question of granting bail arises on merits. [Customs, New Delhi v. AhmadalievaNodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].
- (c). The provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act provide the legal norms which have to be applied in determining whether a case for grant of bail has been made out. [UOI v. Prateek Shukla, (2021) 5 SCC 430, Para 12].
- (d). In case the Court proposes to grant bail, two conditions are to be mandatorily satisfied in addition to the standard requirements under the provisions of the CrPC or any other enactment. [Union of India v. Niyazuddin&Anr, (2018) 13 SCC 738, Para 7].
- (e). Apart from granting opportunity to the Public Prosecutor, the other twin conditions which really have relevance are the Court's satisfaction that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [N.R. Mon v. Md. Nasimuddin, (2008) 6 SCC 721, Para 9].
- (f). The satisfaction contemplated regarding the accused being not guilty has to be more than prima facie grounds, considering substantial probable causes for believing and justifying that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [Customs, New Delhi v. AhmadalievaNodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].
- (g). The reasonable belief contemplated in the provision requires existence of such facts and circumstances as are sufficient in themselves to justify satisfaction that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [State of Kerala v. Rajesh, AIR 2020 SC 721, Para 21].
- (h). Twin conditions of S. 37 are cumulative and not alternative. [Customs, New Delhi v. AhmadalievaNodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].
- (i). At the bail stage, it is neither necessary nor desirable to weigh the evidence meticulously to arrive at a positive finding as to whether or not the accused has committed an offence under the NDPS Act and further that he is not likely to commit an offence under the said Act while on bail. [Union of India v. Rattan Mallik @ Habul, (2009) 2 SCC 624, Para 14].

(j). If the statements of the prosecution witnesses are believed, then they would not result in a conviction. [Babua v. State of Orissa, (2001) 2 SCC 566, Para 3].

(k). Merely recording the submissions of the parties does not amount to an indication of a judicial mind or a judicious application of mind. [UOI v. Prateek Shukla, (2021) 5 SCC 430, Para 12].

(l). Section 37 departs from the long-established principle of presumption of innocence in favour of an accused person until proved otherwise. [Union of India v. Sanjeev v. Deshpande, (2014) 13 SCC 1, Para 5].

(m). While considering the application for bail concerning Section 37, the Court is not called upon to record a finding of not guilty. [Union of India v. Shiv Shanker Kesari, (2007) 7 SCC 798, Para 11].

(n). The confessional statement recorded under Section 67 of the NDPS Act is inadmissible in the trial of an offence under the NDPS Act. [Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1]

(o). In the absence of clarity on the quantitative analysis of the samples from the laboratory, the prosecution cannot be heard to state at this preliminary stage that the accused possessed a commercial quantity of psychotropic substances as contemplated under the NDPS Act. [Bharat Chaudhary v. Union of India, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1235, Para 10].

(p). When there is evidence of conscious possession of commercial quantity of psychotropic substances, such accused is not entitled to bail given Section 37 of the Act as contemplated under the NDPS Act. [State by (NCB) Bengaluru v. Pallulabid Ahmad Arimutta, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 47, Para 12].

(p). Bail must be subject to stringent conditions. [Sujit Tiwari v. State of Gujarat, 2020 SCC Online SC 84, Para 12].

[31]. Satisfying the fetters of S. 37 of the NDPS Act is candling the infertile eggs. The stringent conditions of section 37 placed in the statute by the legislature do not create a bar for bail for specified categories, including the commercial quantity; however, it creates hurdles by placing a reverse burden on the accused, and once crossed, the rigors no more subsist, and the factors for bail become similar to the bail petitions under general penal statutes like IPC.

10. 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, (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions.

11. 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.

12. In Mahidul Sheikh v. State of Haryana, CRM-33030-2021 in CRA-S-363-2020, decided on 14-01-2022, Para 53, [Law Finder Doc Id # 1933969], this Court observed,

[53]. The pragmatic approach is that while granting bail with sureties, the "Court" and the "Arresting Officer" should give a choice to the accused to either furnish surety bonds or to handover a fixed deposit, or direct electronic money transfer where such facility is available, or creating a lien over his bank account. The accused should also have a further option to switch between the modes. The option lies with the accused to choose between the sureties and deposits and not with the Court or the arresting officer.

13. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner 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, any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned 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. Said fixed deposit may be made from any of the banks where the stake of the State is more than 50% or any of the well-established and stable private sector banks. The fixed deposit need not necessarily be made from the petitioner's account.

(c). Such court shall have a lien over the deposit 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). It shall be the total discretion of the petitioner to choose between surety bond and fixed deposit. It shall also be open for the petitioner to apply to the Investigator or the concerned court to substitute the fixed deposit with surety bonds and vice-versa.

(e). On the reverse page of personal bond, the petitioner shall mention her/his permanent address along with the phone number, preferably that number which is linked with the AADHAR, and e-mail (if any). In case of any change in the above particulars, the petitioner shall immediately and not later than 30 days from such modification, intimate about the change to the concerned police station and the concerned court.

(f). 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 also of this bail order.

14. 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.

15. 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. ***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 State shall file the said application.***

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavour to reform and the accused does not repeat the offence, and also to block the menace of drugs abuse. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 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."

19. 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.

20. 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.

21. This order does not, in any manner, limit or restrict the rights of the Police or the investigating agency from further investigation as per law.

22. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offence in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes maximum sentence which is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above, then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

23. 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.

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

25. *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*

CRM-M-30461-2022

download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

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

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

03.02.2023
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.