

227

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

**CRM-M No.41488 of 2020(O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.12.2020**

Shingara Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjeet Singh, AAG, Punjab

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.211 dated 03.06.2020 registered under Sections 21, 22, 61, 85 of NDPS Act at Police Station Sadar Dhuri, District Sangrur.

FIR No.210 was registered on 02.06.2020 under Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sadar Dhuri on the basis of secret information. The said FIR was registered against Jarnail Singh @ Jaily and Shingara Singh (petitioner) for carrying illegal weapons in the car. On the basis of said

information, ruqa was sent to the police for registration of the FIR under the Arms Act. The aforesaid persons were apprehended on the same day and thereafter, present FIR came to be registered on 03.06.2020 at 1:32 AM in the same police station with the allegations that during course of investigation in FIR No.210 dated 02.06.2020, intoxicant tablets and powder were recovered from the car. Jarnail Singh @ Jaily and the petitioner pleaded no knowledge about the intoxicants in the car. They pleaded that one Sansar Singh had to return the amount of Rs.42 lacs to Jarnail Singh @ Jaily. Sansar Singh had borrowed the car from him. Thereafter, they had gone to Barnala where they met Preeti Mann. Preeti Mann in all probabilities must have kept the intoxicant substance in the car at the behest of the petitioner.

During investigation, Jarnail Singh @ Jaily and Shingara Singh have been found to be innocent as per the inquiry conducted by the SP, Sangrur. The discharge report has not been accepted by the Court. That is why, the petitioner is facing the prosecution.

The aforesaid factual position has not been denied by learned learned State counsel except to say that the discharge report has not been accepted by the Court and the petitioner is an accused in the present case. Petitioner is in custody since

03.06.2020.

Looking to the aforesaid facts and in view of the situation arising out due to COVID-19 pandemic and without advertng to the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/concerned Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

18.12.2020

Prince

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No