

**(1999) 8 Supreme Court Cases 552 : 2000 Supreme Court Cases  
(Cri) 6 : 1999 SCC OnLine SC 1029**

(BEFORE G.T. NANAVATI AND R.P. SETHI, JJ.)

KRISHAN MOHAR SINGH DUGAL . . Appellant;

*Versus*

STATE OF GOA . . Respondent.

Criminal Appeals No. 1652 of 1996<sup>+</sup> with No. 1653 of 1996,  
decided on October 7, 1999

**A. Evidence Act, 1872 — Ss. 27 & 26 — Place of concealment already known to police — Recovery from such place — Admissibility — Evidence of witnesses and panchnama showing that the police was already informed**

---

 Page: 553

about the place where charas was concealed before the accused led the police to that place — In such circumstances, held, the charas could not be said to have been recovered on the basis of disclosure statement of the accused — Hence, conviction of the accused under S. 20(b)(ii) of NDPS Act on the basis of such recovery, held, not sustainable — Moreover, since the coconut tree from whose stem the charas was recovered, was standing on an open place accessible to all, held, finding of the courts below that it was the accused who had concealed the charas there, held, not sustainable — Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, S. 20(b)(ii) — Conviction under — On facts, if legal

**(Para 2)**

**Suggested Case Finder Search Text (*inter alia*):**

evidence act 27 recover\*

**B. Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 — Ss. 50 and 20(b)(ii) — Recovery of charas from the person of the accused — Whether accused was properly informed of his right under S. 50 of being searched before a Magistrate or a gazetted officer — Proof — On the basis of evidence of the PI who had searched the person of the accused, answered in the affirmative — Hence, conviction confirmed**

*Held :*

The evidence of the PI who had searched the person of the appellant clearly indicates that he first explained to the appellant the purpose of his visit to that place. He then told the appellant that he wanted to carry out a search of the person of the appellant and also the premises. Thereafter he had told the appellant that if

he so desired he could be searched in the presence of a Magistrate or a gazetted officer. The appellant understood very well what he was told. He declined to be searched either in the presence of a Magistrate or a gazetted officer. It is therefore not possible to agree with the contention of the accused that the mandatory requirement of Section 50 was not complied with in the instant case. Hence, his conviction and sentence are confirmed.

(Paras 3 and 5)

**Suggested Case Finder Search Text** (*inter alia*):

narcotic\* 50 (search or seizure)

Cr. A. No. 1652 of 1996 allowed

Cr. A. No. 1653 of 1996 dismissed

H-M/ATZ/21774/CR

Advocates who appeared in this case:

Anil Shrivastava, Advocate (*amicus curiae*) and Ambrish Kumar, Advocate, for the Appellant;

Ms A. Subhashini, Advocate, for the Respondent.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

**G.T. NANAVALI, J.**— The appellants in these two appeals were tried before the NDPS Court, Mapusa in Special Crime Case No. 42 of 1992 for committing the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii) of the NDPS Act. The trial court convicted both the accused and imposed a sentence of 15 years and ordered them to pay a fine of Rs 2 lakhs each. The appellants then filed two separate appeals before the High Court. Their conviction was confirmed but the sentence was reduced to 10 years and the fine was reduced from Rs 2 lakhs to Rs 1 lakh each. They have filed separate appeals but as

 Page: 554

they arise out of the common judgment they were heard together and are disposed of by this common judgment.

**2.** Mr Anil Shrivastava, learned counsel appearing for appellant Krishan Mohar Singh Dugal submitted that the only evidence against the appellant is the discovery stated to have been made by him of 7 gm of charas. He submitted that the evidence clearly discloses that the police was already informed about the place where charas was concealed before the appellant had taken the police to that place and therefore no reliance could have been placed upon the recovery of charas. Having scrutinised the evidence of the witnesses and the panchnama, we find that the police was already informed about the place where the charas was kept. Thus this is not a case where the

offending article was taken out by the accused from the place of concealment after leading the police to that place and that the police did not know about it earlier. The coconut tree from whose stem charas was found was admittedly standing on an open space accessible to all. It is, therefore, difficult to uphold the finding of the courts below that it was the appellant who had concealed the charas there and that it was found out only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the appellant. The conviction of the appellant Krishan Mohar Singh Dugal, therefore will have to be set aside.

**3.** As regards appellant Revatram R. Thakur, what has been held proved is that charas weighing 10 gm was found from his person. The trial court has recorded that finding on the basis of the evidence of PWs 2 and 6. The High Court has also after reappreciating the evidence confirmed that finding. What was contended on his behalf was that while his person was searched the appellant was not properly informed about his right under Section 50 of the NDPS Act. We do not find any substance in this contention because the PI who had searched the person of the appellant has stated in his evidence that he had asked the appellant whether he would like to be searched before a Magistrate or a gazetted officer. He has also stated that the appellant had declined to be searched in the presence of a Magistrate or a gazetted officer and, therefore, he had searched the appellant in the presence of two panch witnesses. The appellant was thus informed about his right. If the evidence of PI Allen D'Sa is read carefully it becomes apparent that he first explained to the appellant the purpose of his visit to that place. He then told the appellant that he wanted to carry out a search of the person of the appellant and also the premises. Thereafter he had told the appellant that if he so desired he could be searched in the presence of a Magistrate or a gazetted officer. The appellant understood very well what he was told. He declined to be searched either in the presence of a Magistrate or a gazetted officer. It is therefore not possible to agree with the contention of the learned counsel that the mandatory requirement of Section 50 was not complied with in this case.

**4.** Learned counsel also wanted to draw our attention to some irregularities committed in following the procedure with respect to safe custody of the charas seized from the appellant and in other respects. The said irregularities are not of such a nature as would vitiate the trial or the

conviction of the appellant. His conviction, therefore, will have to be confirmed.

**5.** Accordingly, Criminal Appeal No. 1652 of 1996 is allowed. The conviction of appellant Krishan Mohar Singh Dugal and the sentence imposed upon him are set aside and he is acquitted of the charge levelled against him. Criminal Appeal No. 1653 of 1996 is dismissed with the result that his conviction and sentence are confirmed.

— — —

<sup>†</sup> From the Judgment and Order dated 20-3-1995 of the Bombay High Court in Crl. A. No. 7 of 1994

**Disclaimer:** While every effort is made to avoid any mistake or omission, this casenote/ headnote/ judgment/ act/ rule/ regulation/ circular/ notification is being circulated on the condition and understanding that the publisher would not be liable in any manner by reason of any mistake or omission or for any action taken or omitted to be taken or advice rendered or accepted on the basis of this casenote/ headnote/ judgment/ act/ rule/ regulation/ circular/ notification. All disputes will be subject exclusively to jurisdiction of courts, tribunals and forums at Lucknow only. The authenticity of this text must be verified from the original source.