

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

CRM-M-13102-2018

Date of Decision: 10.05.2018

Sandeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Walia, Sr. D.A.G., Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Though as regards the contention raised on the last date of hearing by learned counsel for the petitioner, to the effect that the petitioner would be entitled to keep 100 doses of the drug recovered from him (Buprenorphine), in terms of Rule 66 of the NDPS Rules, 1985, I do not agree with the contention, in view of the fact that even though no prescription is required for upto 100 doses, however, the said 'permission' granted by the statute is for genuine medical need, with no medical need having been shown in the case of the petitioner.

Still, keeping in mind that the petitioner has been in custody for about 01 year, 03 months and 24 days, as per the custody certificate filed in Court today, with no witness stated to have been examined so far, out of 09 prosecution witnesses, and with no other criminal case shown to be registered against him as per the said custody certificate, I consider it appropriate to admit him to bail upon him furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Ordered accordingly.

Nitin
2018.05.14 13:17
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Disposed of.

May 10, 2018
nitin/dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes