

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-9740-2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.04.2016

Puneet Kumar Garg

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

Present: Mr.Ishan Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Reeta Kohli, Addl. AG Punjab with
Mr. Hanspal S Virk, AAG Punjab

SURYA KANT, J. (Oral)

(1) The petitioner seeks his enlargement on regular bail in case FIR No.129 dated 19.09.2013 under Section 21/22/25/27-A/29/61/85 of NDPS Act and Section 420/467/468/471/120-B IPC registered at Police Station Division No.6, Ludhiana.

(2) This is the second bail application moved by the petitioner in the afore-mentioned case. Earlier he filed CRM-M-1159-2014 which was dismissed by this Court on November 18, 2015 observing that the petitioner is involved in more than one cases under the NDPS Act as well as under the IPC.

(3) Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that in FIR No.13 dated 06.01.2010, petitioner had been acquitted way back on 12.11.2014 and now he stands acquitted in the second case also i.e. FIR No.228/2012 vide judgement dated 15.02.2016 As regards third case under Section 386/506 IPC, the same is stated to be pending and the petitioner is on bail.

(4) Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the instant case is now fixed for prosecution evidence and some of the prosecution witnesses have been examined also.

(5) Having heard learned counsel for the parties, it appears to us that though the petitioner has been acquitted in two cases under the NDPS Act referred to in para-7, it would be more expedient that instead of releasing him on bail, a direction to expedite the trial is issued. Since the prosecution is already leading its evidence, we dispose of this petition with the direction to the Special Judge to expedite and conclude the trial before 31.07.2016, if need be, by compelling the prosecution to examine witnesses on weekly basis. The Director General of Police, Punjab shall ensure that the prosecution witnesses remain present for their deposition. Counsel for the petitioner is also directed to cooperate and would not seek unnecessary adjournment.

(6) In the event of delay in conclusion of trial for no fault of petitioner, liberty is granted to move bail application before this Court.

(7) Ordered accordingly.

(Surya Kant)
Judge

05.04.2016
vishal shonkar

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge