

Chainsingh Dhoolsingh Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh

Chainsingh Dhoolsingh Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/506732

Court : Madhya Pradesh

Decided On : Jan-28-1991

Reported in : 1992(0)MPLJ811

Judge : K.K. Verma, J.

Acts : [Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985](#) - Sections 37

Appeal No. : Cri. Misc. Case No. 2048 of 1990

Appellant : Chainsingh Dhoolsingh

Respondent : State of Madhya Pradesh

Advocate for Def. : C.S. Dixit, Dy. Govt. Adv.

Advocate for Pet/Ap. : P.N. Mishra, Adv.

Judgement :

ORDER

K.K. Verma, J.

1. Applicant by Shri P.N. Mishra, Advocate.
2. State by Shri C. S. Dixit, Dy. Government Advocate.
3. They are heard.

4. The applicant was arrested on or about 3-4-1988. It is alleged that he was having illegal possession of 1 Kilogram of Methaqualone. The offence is punishable with an imprisonment which shall not be less than 10 years and a fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees.

5. On 9-1-1991, the learned Judge applied the closure to the right of the prosecution to adduce the evidence of the absent witnesses. The case stood adjourned to 17-1-1991 for examination of the accused but in the meanwhile the record was requisitioned for production before this Court. The attention of Shri Mishra was drawn to Section 37 of the [Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985](#). The relevant portion appears at clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 37. The relevant portion reads as follows:

'37. Offences to be cognisable and non-bailable. - (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974).

(b) no person accused of an offence punishable for a term of imprisonment of five years or more under this Act 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.

The evidence of Constable Madan Mohan (PW1), Rajendra Kumar (PW2), a Security Guard at the M.P.S.R.T.C. Depot and that of another Constable named Narendra Singh Sisodia Manan (PW4), the arrest memo (Ex.P-1) etc. read together, do not lead to the Court's, satisfaction that the applicant is not guilty of the offence in question. In view of this, the provisions of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 37 of the Act are not satisfied in the case besides the case is at the closing stage. Also the nature of the offence is such that a man on being enlarged on bail might very well be tempted to jump bail.

In view of all these circumstances, the bail application is rejected.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com