

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37038-2019

Date of Decision: 25.11.2019

Harpreet Singh @ Happy

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Anish Gautam, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S. Sewak, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the petitioner has again argued in terms of the judgments he was relying upon on the last date of hearing, i.e. Darshan Singh vs. State of Punjab, Law Finder Doc Id # 957083 and Surjeet Kumar vs. State of H.P., Law Finder Doc Id # 1080879, the first judgment is seen to be of the year 1996, with the notification of the Government of India being of a subsequent year (stipulating that the entire quantity of contraband recovered from any accused is to be taken into consideration and not only the salt contained therein), however, the fact remains that the petitioner has been in custody for the past 01 year, with only 03 prosecution witnesses out of 10 having been examined so far.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case for or against the petitioner, the petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be admitted to bail upon his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

November 25, 2019

nitin

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGEYes
No.