

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-24838 of 2018
Date of decision: 19.11.2018**

Ravinder Singh @ Teenu

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed by petitioner-Ravinder Singh @ Teenu under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.7 dated 09.01.2017 registered under Sections 18, 25 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Sirhind, District Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case whereas he was not involved. No independent witness was joined at the time of recovery. The petitioner is not owner of the alleged vehicle, from which, the recovery has been effected. The co-accused of the petitioner is owner of the vehicle. Learned counsel also submits that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, four witnesses have been examined and there is no possibility that the petitioner may influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence. The petitioner is in custody since 09.01.2017 and no other case under NDPS Act is pending against him.

.....

Learned State counsel has not disputed the custody period as well as the stage of trial and the fact that no other case of NDPS Act is pending against the petitioner.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have also perused the contents of the FIR and other documents available on the file.

Without commenting anything on the merits of the case and keeping in view the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 09.01.2017; no other case under NDPS Act is pending against him; the alleged vehicle does not belong to the petitioner; material witnesses are officials and there is no possibility that the petitioner may influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence; the trial may take time to conclude and no purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner (Ravinder Singh @ Teenu) is directed to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

19.11.2018
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes