

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51884 of 2022 (O&M)

DECIDED ON: 23rd January, 2023

Gurpreet Singh

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Iqbal Singh Mann, DAG Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

This is fourth petition seeking regular bail in case of FIR No. 84 dated 12.6.2021, under Section 22(c) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, (for short 'the Act') registered at Police Station Nathana, District Bathinda.

Earlier petitions were dismissed as withdrawn.

Brief facts are that during checking on 12.6.2021, a motor cycle bearing registration No.PB-29-A-3158 driven by petitioner was checked. Sarabjit Kaur @ Babli was the pillion rider and there was recovery of 3500 tablets of Celcidol-100 SR and 1800 tablets of Alprasaft-0.5. The total weight of recovered contraband was 1 kilogram 289 grams + 224 grams=1 kg 513 grams.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 12.6.2021, recovery is from a transparent polythene and till date the trial is not proceeding.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail. He relies upon Section 37 of the Act and submits that the petitioner was driver of the motor cycle and contraband weighing 1 kilogram 513 grams was

recovered. He on instructions further submits that the prosecution witnesses are police officials and an endeavor would be made to examine the prosecution witnesses expeditiously.

It would be gainful to cite following decisions of supreme Court.

The Supreme Court in **“Union of India vs. Shri Shiv Shanker Kesari, 2007 (4) RCR (Criminal) 186”** held as follows :-

“6. As the provision itself provides no person shall be granted bail unless the two conditions are satisfied. They are; the satisfaction of the Court that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty and. that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. Both the conditions have to be satisfied. If either of these two conditions is not satisfied, the bar operates and the accused cannot be released on bail.”

. [Emphasis supplied]

In **State of Kerala etc. Versus Rajesh etc. 2020(1) RCR (Criminal) 818**, it was held:

"20. The scheme of Section 37 reveals that the exercise of power to grant bail is not only subject to the limitations contained under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C, but is also subject to the limitation placed by Section 37 which commences with non obstante clause. The operative part of the said section is in the negative form prescribing the enlargement of bail to any person accused of commission of an offence under the Act, unless twin conditions are satisfied. The first condition is that the prosecution must be given an opportunity to oppose the application; and the second, is that the Court must be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence. If either of these two conditions is not satisfied, the ban for granting bail operates."

21. 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. 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. In the case on hand, the High Court seems to have completely overlooked the underlying object of Section 37 that in addition to the limitations provided under the CrPC, or any other law for the time being in force, regulating the grant of bail, its liberal approach in the matter of bail under the NDPS Act is indeed uncalled for."

[Emphasis supplied]

In **Narcotics Control Bureau Versus Mohit Aggarwal, Crl.A. No.1001-1002 of 2022**, decided on **19th July, 2022**, it was held:

"10. The provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act read as follows:

"[37. Offences to be cognizable and non-bailable.-(1)

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) –

(a) every offence punishable under this Act shall be cognizable;

(b) no person accused of an offence punishable for [offences under section 19 or section 24 or section 27A and also for offences involving commercial quantity] shall be released on bail or on his own bond unless

(i) the Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for such release, and

(ii) where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

(2) The limitations on granting of bail specified in clause (b) of subsection (1) are in addition to the limitations under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or any other law for the time being in force, on granting of bail.]

The expression "reasonable grounds" has come up for discussion in several rulings of this Court. In **"Collector of Customs, New Delhi v. Ahmadalieva Nodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549**, a decision rendered by a Three Judges Bench of this Court, it has been held thus :-

"7. The limitations on granting of bail come in only when the question of granting bail arises on merits. Apart from the grant of opportunity to the Public Prosecutor, the other twin conditions which really have relevance so far as the present accused-respondent is concerned, are: the satisfaction of the court that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. The conditions are cumulative and not alternative. The satisfaction contemplated regarding the accused being not guilty has to be based on

reasonable grounds. 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. 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.”

[emphasis added]

In our opinion the narrow parameters of bail available under Section 37 of the Act, have not been satisfied in the facts of the instant case. At this stage, it is not safe to conclude that the respondent has successfully demonstrated that there are reasonable grounds to believe that he is not guilty of the offence alleged against him, for him to have been admitted to bail. The length of the period of his custody or the fact that the charge-sheet has been filed and the trial has commenced are by themselves not considerations that can be treated as persuasive grounds for granting relief to the respondent under Section 37 of the NDPS Act."

...emphasis supplied

In **Union of India (NCB) etc Versus Khalil Uddin etc, 2022 (4) RCR (Criminal) 984** it was held:

"The High Court by its order which is presently under challenge, directed release of both the accused as stated above on bail after they had undergone custody to the tune of about a year. Questioning grant of relief to said accused, the instant appeals have preferred.

*** ***** *** ***

However, going by the circumstances on record, at this stage, on the strength of the statement of Md. Nizam Uddin, though allegedly retracted later, the matter stands on a different footing. In our considered view, in the face of the mandate of Section 37 of the Act, the High Court could not and ought not to have released the accused on bail. We, therefore, allow these appeals, set aside the view taken by the High Court and direct that both the appeals be taken in custody forthwith.”

...emphasis supplied

It is not in dispute that commercial quantity of contraband was recovered. The only ground pressed for seeking bail is the custody period.

Considering the decisions of the Supreme Court cited above, custody period cannot be sole ground for grant of bail in view of the provisions of Section 37 of the Act.

Moreover, there is no inordinate delay in trial. It cannot be lost sight of that in cases where contraband recovered is of commercial quantity, 180 days are provided for presentation of the challan.

No ground is made out for grant of bail.

The petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been dismissed, pending application, if any is rendered infructuous.

23rd January, 2023
reema

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>