

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

213A

CRM-M-15795-2020

Date of decision : 14.08.2020.

Rohit Kumar @ Jimmy

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vijay Kumar Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.19 dated 17.01.2020, under Sections 22, 29 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is alleged in the FIR that tablets containing Tramadol with a total weight of 409 grams approximately were recovered from the petitioner and co-accused, namely, Vijay Kumar. He also contends that the petitioner is in custody for over 07 months and is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act. He has relied upon the judgment of Coordinate Benches of this Court in the case of **Kashmir Singh vs. State of Punjab**, in CRM-M-7437 of 2019, decided on 21.02.2019 wherein the petitioner therein had been granted regular bail as he was in custody for over seven months and the judgment in the case of **Karaj Singh vs. State of Punjab**, in CRM-M-23811 of 2018, decided on 09.07.2018, wherein the petitioner therein had been granted regular bail after custody of six

months.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Satwinder Pal Singh, contends that although challan has been filed but charges are yet to be framed. He also contends that the petitioner is in custody for 06 months and 24 days as on 13.08.2020 and is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act.

Heard through video conferencing.

In view of the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, especially when the petitioner is in custody for almost 07 months; he is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act; the judgements of the Coordinate Benches of this Court; the COVID-19 pandemic and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

August 14, 2020
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No