

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36036-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: - 12.11.2020

Manjit Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Dinesh Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

(Through video conferencing)

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

CRM-27232-2020

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

CRM-M-36036-2020

Present is the second petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No.88 dated 11.03.2020, under Sections 22-61-85 of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Barara, District Ambala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner is behind the bars since 11.03.2020 and therefore, he be granted the benefit of regular bail.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Tanisha Peshwaria, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, who has joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of State of Haryana.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioner on the ground that apart from the present FIR, there is another FIR, which has been registered against the petitioner for the violation of the NDPS Act in the year 2017. Learned State counsel further submits that not only this, there are three more FIRs registered against the petitioner under the various provisions of the IPC.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

The conduct of the petitioner is such, it does not deserve the benefit for which the present petition has been filed. After the petitioner was granted the bail in FIR No.185 dated 28.06.2017, registered under Sections 21 & 22 of the NDPS Act and under Sections 28A & 28C of the Drug Act, at Police Station Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala, petitioner has indulged the same activities for which the present FIR was registered. The conduct of the petitioner amounts violation of bail conditions imposed while granting him bail in FIR No.185 dated 28.06.2017.

Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out to grant the petitioner the benefit of regular bail.

Dismissed.

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

November 12, 2020
naresh.k

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes

Whether reportable?

No