

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

CRM-M-13527-2020

Date of Decision: 12.06.2020

Sony Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Mandeep Kumar Dhot, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupinder Beniwal, A.A.G., Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

All cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

As regards the contention of learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners be granted interim bail because the report of the FSL has not been received as yet, it is to be noticed that as per the case of the investigating agency, 70 injections of Pantazocine Lactate were recovered, with each injection said to be of 1 milliliter.

Hence, *prima facie* at least, it would seem that 70 ml of Pantazocine Lactate injections were recovered.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case (even as regards the quantity recovered) at this stage at least I see no reason to admit the petitioners to interim bail.

As regards the contention of counsel for the petitioners that a co-accused was granted bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, it

is to be noticed that in the order of that very court, rejecting the application of the petitioner, it has been stated that that court had missed the fact in the case of the co-accused that earlier a similar application had already been dismissed and therefore, the petitioners could not claim parity with their co-accused, simply because the court itself had made an error.

Learned counsel for the State has also pointed to the fact that even as per the order of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, there are various other criminal cases also registered against both the petitioners.

Dismissed, at this stage.

June 12, 2020
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No.