

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211)

CRM-M-14030 of 2020

Date of Decision: 19.06.2020

Gurmeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

All the 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.

By this petition, filed under the provisions of Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of bail, upon FIR no.96, dated 08.09.2019, having been registered at Police Station Odhan, District Sirsa, against him, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Section 22(c) of the NDPS Act, 1985.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact the petitioner has been named as an accused only upon an alleged disclosure statement of the person from whom (allegedly) as per the case of the investigating agency, 32500 tablets of *Tramadol Hydrochloride* were recovered; and the reason for the false implication is that upon the petitioner having been arraigned as an accused in FIR no.29 dated 11.03.2015, at Police Station Odhan, District Sirsa, he was eventually acquitted by the trial

court vide its order dated 21.01.2019, with the trial court in the concluding para thereof, having issued show cause notices to four police officials of the same police station, firstly to explain as to why the provisions of the NDPS Act were not followed in that case, and secondly, as to why damages should not be imposed upon them for illegal confinement of the petitioner. (A copy of the said judgment has been sent in the group created by the Coordinator of this video conferencing, with the Reader of this court, as also the Coordinator and the learned State counsel being part of that group. The said judgment has been put to this court by way of 'whatapp communication' by the Reader of this court).

In view of the above, without making any comment on the merits of the case, for or against the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to admit the petitioner to bail during the pendency of the trial.

Consequently, this petition is allowed, with the petitioner directed to be enlarged on bail, upon his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

19.06.2020
Vcgarg/nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: Yes