

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-37367 of 2015.

Decided on:-17.12.2015.

Rinkal Kumar.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.119 dated 23.7.2015 under Section 22 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegation against the petitioner is that there was a recovery of 11 vials of Raxcoff Syrup and 18 strips of tablets of Carisoma. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 23.7.2015 and even the FSL report is awaited. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jagir Singh, does not dispute the custody of the petitioner as well as the fact that the

petitioner is not involved in any other case and FSL report is awaited.

Heard.

Taking into consideration the order passed by this Court in *CRM-M No.38662 of 2015* decided on 10.12.2015 titled as *Vishal Kumar @ Vishu Versus State of Punjab* as well as *CRM-M No.42099 of 2013* decided on 26.5.2014 titled as *Pradeep Singh Versus State of Punjab*, wherein in a case of recovery of 60 vials of Rexcof, 200 tablets of Carsol and 450 tablets of Carisoma from a car, the petitioners were admitted on bail and coupled with the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 23.7.2015 and he is not involved in any other case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is admitted to regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

However, It is made clear that before releasing the petitioner, he will furnish an undertaking to the effect that he will not indulge in the similar activity again in future and that in case of his doing so, bail order passed in his favour will be liable to be cancelled.

Needless to say that the expression made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall be at liberty to decide the case on the basis of availability of evidence.

December 17, 2015
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE