

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58176-2023 (O&M)
Date of order: 13.12.2023

Anil Mukhiya
... Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of U.T., Chandigarh
...Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Sumit Jain, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
213	19.12.2022	Sector 39, Chandigarh	21 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 276 grams of heroin, has come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.
2. In paragraph 20 of the bail petition, the petitioner declares that he has no criminal history, however, in paragraph 6 of the status report, the State declares the following criminal antecedents of the petitioner as under:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offences	Police Station
1.	198	2021	52A of the Prisons Act	City Roopnagar

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 into the commercial category, and given the criminal past, the accused is likely to indulge in crime once released on bail.

REASONING:

5. In **Paramjeet Singh v. State of Punjab**, 2022:PHHC:003983 [Para 8], CRM-M 50243 of 2021, this Court observed,

While considering each bail petition of the accused with a criminal history, it throws an onerous responsibility upon the Courts to act judiciously with reasonableness because arbitrariness is the antithesis of law. The criminal history must be of cases where the accused was convicted, including the suspended sentences and all pending First Information Reports, wherein the bail petitioner stands arraigned as an accused. In reckoning the number of cases as criminal history, the prosecutions resulting in acquittal or discharge, or when Courts quashed the FIR; the prosecution stands withdrawn, or prosecution filed a closure report; cannot be included. Although crime is to be despised and not the criminal, yet for a recidivist, the contours of a playing field are marshy, and graver the criminal history, slushier the puddles.

6. A perusal of the petition does not refer to any averment based on which this Court is assured that if this recidivist is released on bail, then he shall not indulge in criminal behavior.

7. The facts of the case are extracted from paragraph 2 of the status report dated 29.11.2023, which read as under:

“2. That in compliance to the order dated 23.11.2023, it is submitted that the present case was registered on complaint of SI Om Parkash with the averments that on 19.12.2022 at about 6:30 PM, he alongwith the police party were patrolling for prevention of crime in UT area and the reached the parking of sector 37-D Market. One person was seeing coming from the small booths at market, who on seeing the police party turned around and stood at the corner booth no. 326 at the market. The St got suspicious and the said person seeing himself getting caught tried to throw one transparent polythene from the pocket of his jacket. The SI apprehended the said person and from his possession 276 grams Heroin was recovered. Thereafter, the present FIR was registered against the present petitioner.”

8. Thus, the quantity allegedly involved in this case is commercial. Given this, the rigours of Section 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.

9. Ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that the investigator conducted search and seizure violating Sections 42 and 50 of the NDPS.

10. Whether the Investigator complied with the mandatory provisions of sections 42 and 50 of the NDPS Act is a question of fact to be adjudicated in the trial. However, before this court treats the compliances as illegal, the prosecution needs an opportunity

to prove that they had complied with the mandatory provisions per law. Such stage would come only during the trial and certainly not at the bail stage, where it would be hit by the maxim *Audi alteram partem*. The exception to this would be applicable only when the non-compliance of the mandatory provisions of sections 42 and 50 of the NDPS Act is apparent on the face of the special report under section 57 of the NDPS Act and other documents of search and seizure, and in the opinion of the court, the lapse is non-rectifiable, after recording a finding that it is an incurable defect, the court might consider granting bail on such violations.

11. In **State of H.P. v. Prithi Chand**, (1996) 2 SCC 37, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

"[3]. The question is whether the learned Sessions Judge was justified, at the stage of taking cognizance of the offence, in discharging the accused, even before the trial was conducted on merits, on the ground that the provisions of Section 50 of the Act had not been complied with. This Court in *State of Punjab v. Balbir Singh* [(1994) 3 SCC 299] : (AIR 1994 SCW 1802) has considered the provisions of the Act. Section 50 has been held to be mandatory. In paragraph 16, this Court has held that it is obligatory on the part of the empowered or the authorised officer to inform the suspect that, if so required, he would be produced before a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate and search would be conducted in his presence. It was imperative on the part of the Officer to inform the person of the above right and if he failed to do the same, it amounted to violation of the requirement of Section 50 of the Act. It was held that when the person was searched he must have been aware of his right and that it could be done only if the authorised or empowered Officer informed him of the same. Accordingly, this Court by implication read the obligation on the part of authorised Officer to inform the person to be searched of his right to information that he could be searched in the presence of the Gazetted Officer or the Magistrate. In *Saiyad Mohd. Saiyaad Umar Saiyed v. State of Gujarat* [1995(3) JT SC 489] a three-Judge Bench of this Court had reiterated the above view and held that having regard to the grave consequences that might entail the possession of illicit articles under the Act, viz., the shifting of the onus to the accused and the severe punishment to which he became liable, the Legislature had enacted safeguards contained in Section 50. Compliance of the safeguards in Section 50 is mandatory obliging the Officer concerned to inform the person to be searched of his right to demand that search could be conducted in the presence of a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate. The possession of illicit article has to be satisfactorily established before the Court. The Officer who conducts search must state in his evidence that he had informed the accused of his right to demand, while he is searched, in the presence of a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate and that the accused had not chosen to so demand. If no evidence to that effect is given, the Court must presume that the person searched was not informed of the protection the law gives him and must find that possession of illicit articles was not established. The presumption under Article 114, illustration (e) of the Evidence Act, that the official duty was properly performed, therefore, does not apply. It is the duty of the Court to carefully scrutinise the evidence and satisfy that the accused had been informed by the concerned Officer that he had a right to be

searched before a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate and that the person had not chosen to so demand.

[4]. It is to be seen whether the accused has been afforded such a right and whether the authorised Officer has violated the mandatory requirement, as a question of fact, has to be proved at the trial. In *Pooran Mal v. Director of Inspection* [(1974) 1 SCC 345] : (AIR 1974 SC 348) a Constitution Bench of this Court had held that power of search and seizure, is, in any system of jurisprudence, an overriding power of the State for the protection of social security and that power is necessarily regulated by law. A search by itself is not a restriction on the right to hold and enjoy property, though seizure is a temporary restriction to the right of possession and enjoyment of the property seized. However, the seizure will be only temporary and limited for the purpose of the investigation. The power of search and seizure is an accepted norm in our criminal law envisaged in Sections 96 to 103 and 165 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 [for short, "the Code"]. The Evidence Act permits relevancy as the only test of admissibility of evidence. The evidence obtained under an illegal search and seizure does not exclude relevant evidence on that ground. It is wrong to invoke the spirit of Constitution to exclude such evidence. The decisions of the American Supreme Court spelling out certain Constitutional protections in regard to search and seizure are not applicable to exclude the evidence obtained on an illegal search. Courts in India refuse to exclude relevant evidence merely on the ground that it is obtained by illegal search and seizure. When the test of admissibility of evidence lies in relevancy, unless there is an express or necessarily implied prohibition in the Constitution or other law, evidence obtained as a result of illegal search and seizure, is not liable to be shut out. Search and seizure are not a new weapon in the armoury of those whose duty it is to maintain social security in its broadest sense. If the safeguards are generally on the lines adopted by the Code, they would be regarded as adequate and render the restrictions imposed as reasonable measures.

[7]. It would thus be settled law that every deviation from the details of the procedure prescribed for search, does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that search by the police renders the recovery of the articles pursuant to the illegal search, irrelevant evidence nor the discovery of the fact inadmissible at the trial. Weight to be attached to such evidence depends on facts and circumstances in each case. The Court is required to scan the evidence with care and to act upon it when it is proved and the Court would hold that the evidence would be relied upon."

12. The stand that the accused is in custody for sufficient time is also not legal grounds to overcome the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act at this stage.

13. The grounds taken in the bail petition do not shift the burden placed by the legislature on the accused under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. The petitioner has not stated anything to discharge the burden put by the stringent conditions placed in the

statute by the legislature under section 37 of the NDPS Act. Thus, the petitioner has failed to make a case for bail at this stage.

14. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached, *prima facie* points towards the petitioner’s involvement and does not make out a case for bail. Any further discussions are likely to prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

15. 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.

The petition is dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand closed. However, considering the petitioner's right to speedy trial coupled with the pre-trial incarceration, this court requests the concerned trial court to make all endeavours to conclude the trial within six months, of which the prosecution evidence be completed preferably within five months and the remaining time to provide an opportunity to the accused to lead defence evidence, if so desired, and to conclude its hearing. To meet the deadline, an endeavour be made to speed up the process for service and to pass the necessary directions in this regard. It is clarified that if expediting this trial disturbs the docket of the concerned court, then a balance be struck, and if, on this account, any delay happens, then an extension can be sought by mentioning such reasons. It is clarified that this order speeding up the trial is subject to the condition that neither the petitioner shall seek any adjournment nor try to use any tactics to delay the trial. If they do so, this order of expediting the trial shall stand automatically recalled by resorting to Section 362, read with Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, without any further reference to this court. If any of the accused is on bail and fails to attend the trial without any sufficient cause, then they be dealt with strictly but in accordance with the law. It is clarified that if the trial is not concluded by the date mentioned above, and if the delay is not attributable to the petitioner, then the petitioner may file an application for bail before the trial court, which shall decide it expeditiously and consider the bail on the grounds of pre-trial custody, and all the previous orders of dismissal passed by the trial court or High Court shall not come in the way.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

December 13, 2023
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	Yes