

(2024) 03 GUJ CK 0067

In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : R/Criminal Misc.Application No. 21334 Of 2023 (For Regular Bail - After Chargesheet)

Mayurkumar Dilipbhai Parmar

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 19-03-2024

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 439
Narcotic Drugs And Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 — Section 8(C), 17(B), 18(C), 29

Citation : (2024) 03 GUJ CK 0067

Hon'ble Judges : Divyesh A. Joshi, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Maulik M Soni, Krina Calla

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Divyesh A. Joshi, J

1. Rule. Learned APP waives service of notice of rule for respondent – State of Gujarat.

2. The present application is filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for regular bail in connection with the FIR being C.R. No.11207028230637/2023 registered with the Halol Town Police, Panchmahal Station for the offence punishable under Sections 8(C), 17(B), 18(C) and 29 of the NDPS Act.

3. Learned advocate for the applicant submitted that the so-called incident has taken place on 27.09.2023, for which, the FIR has been lodged on 27.09.2023 and the applicant has been arrested in connection with the same on 27.09.2023 and since then, he is in judicial custody. Learned advocate submitted that now the investigation is completed and after submission of the chargesheet, the present application is preferred. Learned advocate submitted that on the basis of

the secret information received by the members of the raiding party, a raid was carried out and during raid, car of the present applicant was intercepted by the members of the raiding party and during search, 480 Gram opium was recovered from the said car, which can be said to be intermediate quantity, which is less than commercial quantity and more than smaller quantity. Learned advocate submitted that the applicant is the student of the accused no.1 and the said car, which was intercepted by the members of the raiding party, belongs to the accused no.1. Learned advocate submitted that the co-accused has been considered by this Court and the applicant is not having any antecedent. It is, therefore, urged that considering the nature of the offence, the applicant may be enlarged on regular bail by imposing suitable conditions.

4. Learned APP for the respondent-State has opposed grant of regular bail looking to the nature and gravity of the offence. It is submitted that the role of the present applicant is clearly spelt out from the papers of the chargesheet. Learned APP submitted that from the conscious possession of the present applicant, contraband articles (i.e. opium) was recovered by the members of the raiding party and thus, there is direct involvement of the present applicant found out. It is, therefore, urged that the present application may not be entertained.

5. Learned advocates appearing on behalf of the respective parties do not press for further reasoned order.

6. I have heard the learned advocates appearing on behalf of the respective parties and perused the papers of the investigation and considered the allegations levelled against the applicant and the role played by the applicant. It is found out from the record that the present application is preferred after submission of the chargesheet and now the investigation is completed and the applicant is in jail since 27.09.2023. The contraband articles seized by the members of the raiding party is intermediate quantity and the applicant is not having antecedent. I have considered the role attributed to the present applicant at the time of commission of crime and the role attributed to co-accused, who has been considered by this Court. Therefore considering the above factual aspects and on the ground of parity, the present application deserves to be allowed.

7. This Court has also taken into consideration the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Sanjay Chandra v. Central Bureau of Investigation, reported in [2012] 1 SCC 40 as well as in case of Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation & Anr. reported in (2022) 10 SCC 51.

8. In the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the nature of the allegations made against the applicant in the FIR, without discussing the evidence in detail, prima facie, this Court is of the opinion that this is a fit case to exercise the discretion and enlarge the applicant on regular bail.

9. Hence, the present application is allowed. The applicant is ordered to be released on regular bail in connection with the FIR being C.R.

No.11207028230637/2023 registered with the Halol Town Police, Panchmahal Station on executing a personal bond of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court and subject to the conditions that he shall;

[a] not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse liberty;

[b] not act in a manner injurious to the interest of the prosecution;

[c] surrender passport, if any, to the concerned court within a week;

[d] not leave the State of Gujarat without prior permission of the concerned court;

[e] mark presence before the concerned Police Station on alternate Monday of every English calendar month for a period of six months between 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m.;

[f] furnish the present address of residence to the Investigating Officer and also to the Court at the time of execution of the bond and shall not change the residence without prior permission of this Court;

10. The authorities will release the applicant only if he is not required in connection with any other offence for the time being. If breach of any of the above conditions is committed, the concerned Sessions Judge concerned will be free to issue warrant or take appropriate action in the matter. Bail bond to be executed before the lower Court having jurisdiction to try the case. It will be open for the concerned Court to delete, modify and/or relax any of the above conditions, in accordance with law.

11. At the trial, the trial Court shall not be influenced by the observations of preliminary nature qua the evidence at this stage made by this Court while enlarging the applicant on bail.

12. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. Direct service is permitted.