

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

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M-16727-2020 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 14.07.2020**

\*\*\*\*

Ranjit Singh

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

\*\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. BS Sewak, AAG Punjab

\*\*\*\*

**GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (Oral)**

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing on account of lockdown due to outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic.

The petitioner Ranjit Singh stated to be aged 30 years, has filed the present petition *inter alia* with a prayer for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.242 dated 22.12.2017 under Sections 21,25/61/85 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at PS Doraha, Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present case the FIR is dated 22.12.2017. Learned counsel then submits that vide order dated 24.01.2018, he was granted regular bail by the Special Court, Ludhiana. However, he could not appear before the Court on 10.10.2018 as he had met with an accident. On 16.10.2018, he had also moved an application for exemption. Thereafter due to bad health, the petitioner could not remain in touch with his counsel before the trial court. Resultantly, non-bailable warrants were issued on 23.10.2018. Thus counsel submits that petitioner's non-appearance was *bona fide*.

Notice of motion.

On the asking, Mr. BS Sewak, AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent through video conferencing.

Learned State counsel on the other hand submits that there is another FIR No.114 dated 31.08.2019. He submits that the petitioner is on bail in that case but because of the reason he had been involved in another FIR after the bail granted in the present case on 24.01.2018, he is not entitled to concession of bail.

Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender on 06.06.2019 but he has been in custody since 05.10.2019. He then submits that due to COVID situation retention of the petitioner in jail is dangerous to his life and otherwise also the trial is likely to take some time.

In view of the above, this Court deems it appropriate to release the petitioner on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Duty Magistrate/trial court concerned.

In view of the peculiar circumstances as noticed above, in addition to bail bonds/additional surety which the trial court may further require the petitioner to furnish as it deems appropriate, the petitioner is directed to furnish FDR of Rs.5 lakhs in his name valid for 3 years before the Duty Magistrate/trial Court and shall give an undertaking that he will not encash the same. This shall await further orders of this Court.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression on merits of the case.

Disposed of.

**14.07.2020**

*vishal shonkar*

**(Girish Agnihotri)**  
**Judge**

1. *Whether speaking/reasoned?*
2. *Whether reportable?*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*