

IN THE COURT OF THE SPECIAL JUDGE FOR N.D.P.S. CASES
AT GREATER MUMBAI

COMMON ORDER

IN

N.D.P.S. BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2571 OF 2021

along with

N.D.P.S. BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2576 OF 2021

along with

N.D.P.S. BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2583 OF 2021

IN

NCB/MZU/CR-94/2021

1. Aryan Shah Rukh Khan

Age : 23 years, Student

R/o : Mannatt, Bandra Bandstand,
Bandra (W), Mumbai – 400 050.

2. Arbaaz A. Merchant

Age : 26 years,

R/o : Winnie Apartments,
Perry Cross Road, Opp. Demote Park,
Bandra(W), Mumbai – 400 050.

3. Ms. Munmun Amit Kumar Dhamecha

Age : 28 years, Occu. : Professional,

R/o : Yadav Colony,
Tehsil Madukar Shah Ward, Sagar,
Madhya Pradesh – 470 001.

... Applicants/ Accused nos. 1 to 3

V/s.

The Union of India,
(Through the Intelligence Officer,
Narcotics Control Bureau,
Mumbai Zonal Unit, Mumbai)

... Respondent

Appearance :-

Shri Amit Desai with Shri Satish Maneshinde, Advs. for applicant/accused no.1.

Shri Taraq Sayed, Adv. for applicant/accused no.2.

Shri Ali Kaashif Khan Deshmukh, Adv. for applicant/accused no.3.

Shri Anil Singh, Addl. Solicitor General with SPP Shri A. M. Chimalkar and Shri Advait Sethana for respondent.

CORAM : HIS HONOUR THE SPECIAL JUDGE

V. V. PATIL (C.R.NO.44)

DATE : 20th October, 2021

ORDER

These are applications for grant of bail under section 439 of Cr.P C. filed by **applicant/accused no.1 Aryan Shah Rukh Khan, no.2 Arbaaz A. Merchant and no.3 Ms. Munmun Amit Kumar Dhamecha** who are arrested by officers of respondent on 3/10/2021 for violation of offences under sections 8(c) r/w 20(b), 27, 28, 29 and 35 of Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (herein after referred to as 'NDPS Act, 1985') in connection with C. R. No. 94/2021.

2. It is the case of prosecution that on specific information received, the officers of NCB effected seizure of 13 grams of Cocaine, 5 grams of Mephedrone (MD), 21 grams of Charas and 22 Pills of MDMA (Ecstasy) and 1,33,000/- INR at International Cruise Terminal, Green Gate, Mumbai under panchanama dtd. 2.10.2021. In connection with above mentioned seizure, voluntary statements of applicants/accused under section 67 of NDPS Act came to be recorded.

3. On the basis of panchanama dtd. 2.10.2021 coupled with the voluntary statements of above mentioned accused, accused were arrested by the officers of Investigating Agency at 14.00 hrs. for their

involvement in consumption, sale, purchase and attempt to commit offence under section 8(c) r/w section 20(b), section 27, 28, 29 read with section 35 of NDPS Act, 1985, vide C. R. No. 94/2021.

4. Now, the applicant/accused no.1 Aryan Khan sought bail on the grounds that he is innocent and has not committed any crime and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. No narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances have been seized from the applicant no.1 and the allegations, assuming without admitting them to be true, would pertain strictly to small quantities, the bar under sections 37(1) of the NDPS Act, 1985 would not apply in the present facts and circumstances. Thus, the applicant ought to be enlarged on bail forthwith. That there is nothing on record to suggest that the present applicant is in any way connected with the production, manufacture, possession, sell, purchase, transport, import, export or use of any psychotropic substance or the financing, illicit trafficking and/or harboring of offenders in relation to any narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances and hence the ingredients of any offence under the NDPS Act, 1985 Act are not prima-facie made out in respect of the present applicant. It is further submitted that the applicant has no criminal antecedents of any nature whatsoever. The applicant has strong roots in the society and is a permanent resident of Mumbai and there is no likelihood of his absconding. He is ready and willing to co-operate with the Investigating Agency as and when required. Lastly, he prayed for releasing him on bail.

5. Applicant/accused no. 2, Arbaaz Merchant sought bail on the grounds that he has been falsely implicated in the case. The alleged recovery at his instance is an independent recovery and even if same is considered to be true it amounts to 6 grams of Charas which is small in

quantity. There is absolutely no connection between applicant/accused no.2 and the organizers of the Cruise. The panchanama itself is evident that recoveries effected in the instant case at the alleged spot are independent recoveries and he has no connection whatsoever with the alleged recoveries made at the instance of other co-accused. The applicant/accused no.2 is permanent resident of Mumbai and has a family to maintain and therefore he would not abscond. On these grounds he prayed for releasing on bail.

6. Applicant/accused no.3, Ms. Munmun Dhamecha sought bail on the grounds that she is not at all concerned with alleged offence in any manner. She is nowhere related and connected with applicants/accused no 1 & 2. She was invited as a guest in the party which was held at Cordelia Cruise. One Mr. Baldev booked room in the said Cruise Ship. When she entered the room along with Ms. Soumya and Mr. Baldev, the NCB raid occurred in the room where NCB officers found small packet of hash lying on the floor which claims to be of 5 grams weight in quantity. It is further contended that said Mr. Baldev and Miss Soumya Singh, who were present in the room with her were left scott free. It is further submitted that there is no recovery from the person of accused no.3. Even if for sake of argument it is assumed that there is recovery, said recovery is of small quantity as per NDPS Act which deserves bail. There is no bar of Sec.37 to grant bail and hence applicant/accused no.3 is entitled to be released on bail.

7. Respondent strongly opposed the applications by filing reply. It is contended that all the persons arrested in C.R. No. 94 of 2021 are inextricably connected with each other insofar as their acts and omissions constituting offences under NDPS Act is concerned. As

per case of the prosecution applicant/ accused nos. 1 and 2 traveled together with a common intent to set on the said Cruise. The material collected during investigation has primarily revealed that applicant/accused no.1 has role in so far as it is procurement and consumption of contraband is concerned. It is prima-facie revealed that applicant/accused no.1 used to procure contraband from applicant/accused no. 2 and the sources connected to applicant/accused no. 2 from whose possession 6 grams of Charas was recovered. There is material on record so far to show that applicant/accused no. 1 was in touch with some persons abroad who appeared to be a part of an international drug network for illicit procurement of drugs. The investigation in this regard is in progress. The investigation revealed that the supplier to applicant/accused no.1 i.e. accused no. 17 has been arrested with 2.6 grams of Ganja. Further supplier of contraband to applicant/accused no. 2 namely Shivraj Harijan i.e. accused no. 19 has also been intercepted and arrested with 62 grams of Charas. It is so far apparent that accused no. 17 and 19 supplied Charas/ Ganja to applicants/accused no. 1 and 2. The investigation further revealed that applicant/accused no. 3 was arrested on 3/10/2021 with 5 grams of Hashish from her conscious possession. Further, 2 subsequent arrests of two Nigerian nationals revealed that they were suppliers of MDMA pills to accused no. 5 - Mohak Jaiswal and said Mohak Jaiswal further supplied intermediate quantity to accused no. 6 - Ishmmet and accused no. 8 - Nupur. Investigation further revealed that accused no. 9 Abdul Qadir supplied/distributed intermediate quantity of Ecstasy to accused no.5 Mohak Jaiswal.

8. It is further contention of the prosecution that said accused no. 5 Mohak Jaiswal purchased ecstasy pills from accused number 9

Abdul Qadir who was apprehended with 2.5 grams of ecstasy and 54.3 grams of commercial quantity of Mephedrone from his conscious possession. Further prosecution apprehended accused Shreyas Nair with 2 grams of Charas from his conscious possession and accused Manish Rajgarhia with 2.4 grams of Ganja from his conscious possession and accused Avin Sahu with no recovery. Further prosecution arrested four other persons who were the organizers of the said event. Prima-facie material shows that ingredients under sections 28 and 29 are clearly made out. Hence applicant/accused are not entitled to grant of bail. Therefore their applications be rejected.

9. Perused applications and say. Heard Ld. Advocates for all the applicants and Ld. ASG for the respondent at length.

Sr. No.	POINTS	FINDINGS
1.	Whether the applicants/accused no. 1, 2 and 3 are entitled for release on bail?	In the negative
2.	What order?	As per final order

REASONS

10. **As to point No.1:**

It is argued by the Ld. Advocate for the applicant/accused no.1, Shri. Desai that nothing has been recovered from applicant/accused no.1. He was intercepted with accused no.2 with whom 6 grams of Charas of small quantity has been allegedly recovered. Hence there is no bar of section 37 of NDPS Act. There is no nexus between accused no.1 and other accused and therefore recoveries from other accused persons cannot be held against the accused no.1. There is no conspiracy between accused no.1 and co-accused as alleged

by the prosecution and hence section 29 is not applicable. In support of his submissions, he relied upon following citations :

1. Ragini Dwivedi @ Gini @ Rags V/s. State of Karnataka, 2021 SCC Online SC 174.
2. Ranveer Sing V/s. State and another reported in 2021 SCC OnLine Bom. 3036.
3. Shanoob K. H. V/s. State, the Police Inspector/ Officer in charge and Another, 2021 SSC Online Bom 2391.
4. Sangeeta Y. Gaikwad V/s. State of Maharashtra in Criminal Application No. 2597 of 2006 (Bombay High Court).
5. Amarsingh Barot V/s. State of Gujarat (2005) 7 SCC 550.
6. Akash Jariwala V/s. State of Maharashtra in Criminal Bail Application No. 3032 of 2019 (Bombay High Court).
7. Harsh Shah V/s. State of Maharashtra in Bail Application No. 2471 of 2021 (Bombay High Court).
8. Rakesh Singla V/s. Union of India CR M number 23220 of 2020 (O AND M) (High Court of Punjab and Haryana).
9. Noor Aga V/s. State of Punjab and Another (2005) 16 Supreme Court Cases 417.
10. Basheer Alias N.P Basheer V/s. State of Kerala (2004) 3 Supreme Court Cases 609.
11. Jitin Mothukiri V/s. State of Maharashtra 2020 SCC Online Bom 821.
12. Rhea Chakraborty V/s. Union of India in Criminal Bail Application (Stamp) No. 2386 of 2020.
13. Nikesh Shah V/s. Union of India and Others (2018) 11 Supreme Court Cases 1.

11. Per contra, it is argued by Ld. ASG appearing for the

respondent that on the basis of credible information received, officers of the respondent, effected seizure of certain contraband at International Cruise Terminal Green Gate Mumbai from the accused numbers 1 to 8 and on the basis of information received in their statement further follow up action was taken and other accused persons were apprehended from whom small, intermediate and commercial quantity of contraband was seized. All the accused form part of drug chain and they are indulging in illicit trafficking. They have acted in conspiracy in commission of offences. Hence Sec. 29 is invoked. There is strong evidence against the applicants/accused and hence their applications for bail be rejected.

12. In support of his submissions, Ld. ASG relied upon following citations:

1. **Showik Chakraborty V/s. Union of India in Criminal Bail Application (Stamp) No. 2387 of 2020.**
2. **Union of India V/s. Shiv Shanker Kesari (2007) 7 Supreme Court Cases 798.**
3. **Union of India through N.C.B. Lacknow V/s. Md. Nawaz Khan in Criminal Appeal No.1043 of 2021(Arising out of SLP (Cri) No.1771 of 2021 (Supreme Court)**
4. **Durand Didier V/s. Chief Secretary, Union of Territory of Goa (1990) 1 SCC 95.**
5. **State of Orissa V/s. Mahimananda Mishra (2018) 10 SCC 516.**
6. **Union of India V/s. Ram Samujh and Another 1999 SCC (Cri) 1522.**
7. **Collector of Customs, New Delhi V/s. Ahmadalieva Nodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549.**
8. **State of Kerala Etc. V/s. Rajesh Etc. in Criminal Appeal No(s)**

154-157 of 2020 (S.C.).

9. Union of India V/s. Rattan Mallik @ Habul in Criminal Appeal No. 137 of 2009 (S.C.).

10. Bharat @ Mamul s/o Vithaldas Thakkar and another V/s. State of Maharashtra – 1991 SCC Online Bom 309.

11. Gopal Sen Vs. The state (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) in Bail Application No. 1874 of 2007 (High Court of Delhi).

12. Harish Patel V/s. The Inspector of Customs and another- 1996 (3) ALL MR 605.

13. The first ground of bail sought by accused no.1 is absence of recovery from him. It is argued by Ld. Adv. for applicant/accused no. 1 that as per case of the prosecution itself no contraband was found in possession of applicant/accused no. 1. There is absolutely nothing to connect the applicant/accused no.1 with recovery made from other accused. Secondly, it is argued that though respondent tried to connect accused no.1 with recovery of accused no. 2, accused no.1 had no knowledge of the contraband possessed by accused no.2. Thirdly, it is argued that the recovery of contraband from accused no.2 cannot be said to be recovery from conscious possession of accused no.1.

14. Perusal of papers show that though nothing was found in possession of accused no 1, 6 grams of Charas was found with accused no. 2 which was concealed in his shoes. Admittedly accused no 1 and 2 are friends since long. They travelled together and they were apprehended together at the International Cruise Terminal. Further in their voluntary statements both of them disclosed that they were possessing said substance for their consumption and for enjoyment.

Thus all these things go to show that accused no.1 was having knowledge of the contraband concealed by accused no.2 in his shoes.

15. In the recent authority of **Md. Nawaz khan (supra)**, relied upon by the respondent, no contraband was found with the accused. Hon'ble High Court pleased to grant bail by accepting the plea of the accused that he was only a companion in the vehicle which was driven by co-accused and was not in conscious possession of the contraband. Hon'ble Supreme Court set aside the order of Hon'ble High Court and held :

*"In line with the decision of this Court in **Rattan Mallik (supra)**, we are of the view that a finding of the absence of possession of the contraband on the person of the respondent by the High Court in the impugned order does not absolve it of the level of scrutiny required under section 37 (1) (b) (ii) of the NDPS Act."*

16. In the present case also though no contraband is found in possession of accused no.1, 6 grams of Charas was found in possession of accused no.2 of which accused no.1 was having knowledge & thus it can be said that it was in conscious possession of both the accused. Hence all the submissions made on behalf of applicant/accused no.1 in this regard cannot be accepted.

17. Next submission made on behalf of accused no. 1 and 2 is that as per case of the prosecution itself, 6 grams of Charas was found with accused no.2 which was meant for consumption purpose and it

was not for sale, purchase or for any other purpose and rigors of Sec. 37 would not apply and there is no bar to grant bail. It is also argued that though prosecution invoked Sec. 29 of NDPS Act, there is nothing to show nexus of present applicants with other accused.

18. On this point it is vehemently argued by Ld. ASG that all the accused are part of large drug network. Their role cannot be segregated from each other. So far as accused no. 1 is concerned, this is not the first time when accused no. 1 is involved in illicit drug activities. There is ample evidence in the form of Whatsapp chats of accused no.1 with foreign national and unknown persons dealing in drugs. There is reference of hard drugs and bulk quantity in the Whatsapp chats which can not be meant for consumption, with unknown persons who are suspected to be part of international drug racket.

19. During course of argument Whatsapp chats were shown to the Court. Perusal of Whatsapp chats reveals that there are chats of applicant/accused no.1 about drugs with unknown persons. There is also reference of bulk quantity and hard drug in the chats. There is prima-facie material showing that applicant/accused no 1 was in contact with persons dealing in prohibited narcotic substances as alleged by the prosecution.

20. Ld. Adv. for applicant/accused no. 1 relied upon citation in case of **Rakesh Singla (supra)** and submitted that Whatsapp chats without certificate of Sec. 65 (b) of Indian Evidence Act cannot be looked into. However it is pertinent to note that this is stage of investigation. Ld. defence Counsel made submission in anticipation that Whatsapp chats are not supported with Certificate under section 65 (b)

of Indian Evidence Act when defence has no opportunity to go through the material collected by the Investigating Officer. Even if assuming that there is no certificate under section 65 (b) of Indian Evidence Act, at the stage of investigation, it is not necessary. In the above citation relied upon by Ld. defence counsel, charge-sheet was filed. Hence above citation is distinguishable on facts and hence not applicable to the facts of the present case.

21. According to applicants/accused no 1, 2 & 3 they cannot be connected with recovery done from the other accused. In citations of **Amarsingh Barot (supra)** and **Akash Jariwala (supra)** and **Sangita Gaikwad (supra)** relied upon by the accused, the information with regard to two persons involved in the narcotic drugs was received and on personal search contraband were recovered from both the persons. It was held that the contraband cannot be calculated together to hold that it is commercial quantity. It was also held that there was no evidence to suggest that there was criminal conspiracy within the meaning of Section 29 of NDPS Act. Relying upon above authorities it was argued on behalf of applicant/accused no.1 that as observed in the above authorities, merely because some accused are found in possession of contraband, it cannot be said that it constitute independent evidence of criminal conspiracy.

22. As against this, Ld. ASG placed his reliance on the citation of **Mahimananda (supra)** wherein Hon'ble Apex Court held that :

"It is common knowledge that generally direct evidence may not be available to prove conspiracy, inasmuch as the act of conspiracy takes place secretly. Only the conspirators would be knowing about the conspiracy.

However, the court, while evaluating the material, may rely upon other material which suggest conspiracy."

23. In the case at hand material placed on record reveals that there is incriminating material in the form of Whatsapp chat etc. which show the nexus of the applicant/accused no.1 with suppliers and peddlers. There are also Whatsapp chats of applicant/accused no. 2. Moreover accused no.1 to 8 came to be arrested on the Cruise and they were found with certain amount of contraband. Respondents had received specific information that rave party has been organized on the Cruise and accused persons are arriving with contraband and in pursuance of the information raid was effected. Further during the interrogation they disclosed names of persons who supplied contraband to them. Thus all these facts prima-facie go to show that accused acted in conspiracy with each other. It transpires that all the accused are connected in same thread. Aspect of proving the conspiracy which deals with depth is required to be considered only at the time of trial. But prima-facie it appears that there is case of conspiracy and abetment as alleged by the prosecution. Hence Sec. 29 of NDPS act is applicable.

24. It is argued by Ld. Adv. for the accused no.2 that respondent is claiming that there are certain Whatsapp chats and other material found in the mobile phones of the applicant/accused no. 1 and 2. However there is no panchanama of recovery of mobiles of accused no.1 and 2. Then from where respondent got the alleged Whatsapp chats and other material. Hence that alleged material need not be looked into. Whereas, it is submitted on behalf of the respondent that accused no.1 and no.2 voluntarily surrendered their mobiles to the

respondent. Papers were shown to the Court which reflected that both the accused voluntarily surrendered their mobiles to the officers of the respondent at the time of interrogation. Hence submissions made in this respect on behalf of accused no.2 falls to the ground.

25. So far as accused no.3, Munmun Dhamecha is concerned, it is submitted by Ld, Advocate appearing for her that respondent failed to prove any nexus or relation of the applicant/accused no.3 with present case. Respondent has shown recovery of 5 grams of Hashish from her, which is totally false. The NCB team found small packet of hash lying on the floor in the room in which 2 more persons namely Baldev and Soumya were present, who are not arraigned as accused in the present case. Respondent has given no proof that the alleged recovery is attributed to the accused no.3. It is further submitted that there is no recovery from the person of accused no.3. Even if for sake of argument it is assumed that there is recovery, said recovery is of small quantity as per NDPS Act, which deserves bail. There is no bar of Sec. 37 to grant bail and hence accused no.3 is entitled to be released on bail. Ld. Adv. for the accused no. 3 mainly relied on citation in case of **Bristy Biswas Vs. State of Kerala in Bail application number 9387 of 2020 (High Court of Kerala)**.

26. Per contra, Ld. ASG submitted that accused no.3 was arrested on 3/10/2021 with 5 grams of Hashish from her conscious possession. As she was arrested with contraband her culpable mental state is clear and evident. She is found in possession of contraband in consequence of secret information received by NCB. Hence accused no. 3 is also part of network and her case cannot be considered in isolation.

27. I find substance in the arguments made by Ld. ASG. Admittedly, contraband was recovered from the room of the applicant/accused no. 3. She is not denying that the contraband was recovered from the room which was booked in her name. Though accused no.3 claimed that she is not concerned with the said contraband, the panchanama and her voluntary statement recorded by the officers of the respondent shows otherwise. Moreover it is also pertinent to note that raid was effected on the basis of credible information received by the NCB. So far as contention of the applicant/accused no. 3 that two more persons were present in the room at the time of raid is concerned, that is part of investigation which is in progress. Hence submissions made on behalf of applicant/accused no.3 cannot be accepted.

28. In the case of **Showik Chakraborty (Supra)** relied upon by the respondent, no contraband was found with the accused. However, it was held by Hon'ble High Court that :

“25. Applicant appears to be an important link in the chain of drug dealers. He was in touch with different dealers. He had monetary transactions with them. Disclosure by each of them has led to discovery of involvement of others. Hence it is not desirable to release the applicant on bail at this stage.

26. Even otherwise, in the chain, the Applicant is connected with Anuj Keshwani through Abdel and Kaizan as previous links. Commercial quantity of contraband is recovered from Anuj. Therefore, rigors of section 37 would apply since section 29 of NDPS Act is also invoked. It is not

possible to record a satisfaction at this stage that, the applicant has not committed any offence under the NDPS Act involving commercial quantity. Considering the fact that he is a part of large network, it is not possible to observe that he is not likely to commit such offence in future."

29. The facts of the above case are identical with the facts of the present case. In the present case also commercial quantity of 0.54 grams of M.D. is recovered from accused no. 9, who supplied contrabands to other accused as per the case of the prosecution. Therefore in view of observations made by Hon'ble High Court, in the present case also since Section 29 is invoked, rigors of Section 37 would apply. As already noted, while dealing with conspiracy as it is wider concept, it requires a depth of enquiry during the trial.

30. As discussed above, the evidence on record shows that prima-facie there is material to indicate that accused are parts of larger network. As held in the case of **Showik Chakraborty (supra)**, since accused are part of the conspiracy each of them is liable for the entire quantity of drugs seized. Case of each accused can not be segregated from each other and can not be considered in isolation.

31. In the authority of **Rhea Chakraborty (supra)** it has been made clear that all offences under NDPS Act are non-bailable. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that conditions while granting bail as specified in Section 37(1) (b) (ii) of the Act are in addition to the limitations provided under the Cr. P. C., or any other law for time being in force regulate in grant of bail. Jurisdiction to grant bail is

circumscribed by the provisions of section 37 of the NDPS Act which can be granted in the case when there are reasonable grounds to believe that accused is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

32. Moreover, while deciding bail application, apart from the gravity and seriousness of the offence, the antecedents of the applicant, possibility of tampering with evidence and likelihood of commission of offence if released on bail are the relevant factors that needs to be taken into consideration.

33. As argued by learned ASG though no criminal antecedents are there, from Whatsapp chats of applicant no. 1 it is reflected that he was indulging in illicit drug activities. Respondent contended that since all the accused, including accused no.1 are influential persons, they are likely to tamper with evidence of prosecution, if released on bail. Respondent claimed that accused no. 1 is in touch with foreign national and other drug dealers who appears to be part of international drug network and investigation in this regard is going on and respondent is tracing out the criminal antecedents of said persons. If any of the accused is released on bail, it will hamper the entire investigation. During interrogation applicant/accused no. 1 did not disclose names of said persons. Accused no. 1 is the only person who could disclose the details of said persons which are in the exclusive knowledge of accused no 1. In such circumstances if applicant/accused no. 1 is released on bail there are every chances of tampering with evidence as argued by Ld. ASG.

34. Moreover, Whatsapp chats prima-facie reveals that accused

no.1 is dealing in illicit drug activities of narcotic substances on regular basis. Therefore it can not be said that accused no. 1 is not likely to commit similar offence while on bail.

35. Thus considering the prima-facie involvement of the applicants/accused no. 1 to 3 in commission of grave and serious offence, this is not a fit case for granting bail. As discussed above, material placed on record prima-facie shows that Section 29 of NDPS Act is applicable. Therefore rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act would apply. Therefore it is not possible to record a satisfaction at this stage that applicants have not committed any offence under the NDPS Act.

36. Considering the evidence on record it cannot be said that there are reasonable grounds for believing that applicants/accused no. 1, 2 and 3 are not guilty of such offence and they are not likely to commit such offence while on bail. For all the above reasons I hold that bail applications of applicant no. 1, 2 and 3 are liable to be rejected. Hence the following order.

ORDER

1. Bail application no. 2571/21, Bail application no. 2576/21 and Bail application no. 2583/21 stand rejected.
2. Accordingly, Bail applications are disposed of.

(V. V. PATIL)
Special Judge (N.D.P.S.),
City Civil & Sessions Court,
Gr. Mumbai.

Date : 20.10.2021

Dictated on : 20.10.2021
Transcribed on : 20.10.2021
Signed on : 20.10.2021

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL SIGNED JUDGEMENT/ORDER”		
UPLOAD DATE	TIME	NAME OF STENOGRAPHER
20.10.2021	2.50 p.m.	Mrs. S. W. Tuscano
Name of the Judge		HHJ Shri V. V. Patil (CR No.44)
Date of Pronouncement of Judgment/Order.		20.10.2021
Judgment/order signed by P.O. on		20.10.2021
Judgment/order uploaded on		20.10.2021