

CRM-M-25344-2020

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

CRM-M-25344-2020

Date of decision: 03.09.2020

Sukhdev Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Custody certificate by way of affidavit of the Deputy
Superintendent, Central Jail, Kapurthala, has been filed through e-mail.
Print-out of the same is taken on record.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case
FIR No.180 dated 31.08.2019, registered at Police Station Kotwali
Kapurthala, District Kapurthala, under Sections 22 and 29 NDPS Act,
1985.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner
has been indicted on the disclosure statement of the main accused. To
elaborate the facts, he further submits that the petitioner was initially
arrested in FIR No.139 dated 01.09.2019, Police Station Subhanpur and
thereafter, was arrested in FIR No.162 dated 06.08.2019, Police Station
Kotwali, District Kapurthala, on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-

CRM-M-25344-2020

accused therein. Thereafter, the petitioner has been indicted in the present FIR on the disclosure statement of co-accused.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer made in the present petition. He submits that a Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 05.08.2020 passed in CRM-M-53109-2019, while granting bail to the petitioner in FIR No.139 dated 01.09.2019, registered at Police Station Subhanpur, directed him to furnish FDR of Rs.1 lakh in his name valid for two years before the Duty Magistrate/trial Court, which would await further orders of this Court.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been indicted in the present FIR on the disclosure statement of co-accused. The petitioner has been in custody since 24.09.2019. Trial of the case would take time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

03.09.2020

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No