

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42987 of 2019
Date of decision:13.03.2020

Karanveer Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Dhruv Khanna, Advocate for
Mr. I.P.S.Kohli, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. V.G.Jauhar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.75 dated 09.12.2018 under [Section 22 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985](#) registered at Police Station Dhilwan, District Kapurthala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is that he was allegedly found in possession of intoxicating tablets with a total weight of 55 grams of Diphenoxylate Hydrochloride. The petitioner is in custody for more than 09 months. The trial is likely to take sometime to conclude. He has relied upon the judgment of Co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed in **CRM-M-29263 of 2019** titled as **'Gursahib Singh @ Sahba Vs. State of Punjab'**, decided on **17.12.2019** to contend that petitioner therein was allegedly in possession of

64 grams of Diphenoxylate Hydrochloride and had been granted regular bail as he was in custody for over nine months. The petitioner was on interim bail from 29.01.2020 to 02.07.2020.

Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for regular bail. On instructions from ASI Balwinder Singh, learned State counsel has submitted that challan was presented on 03.09.2019 and charges were framed on 16.11.2019. According to his instructions, out of 09 prosecution witnesses, 03 have been examined. He has filed custody certificate dated 12.03.2020 which is taken on record and submits that petitioner is involved in another case bearing FIR No.39 dated 08.06.2016 lodged under Section 454/380 IPC.

Heard.

The petitioner is in custody for about 09 months and 27 days and he did not misuse the concession of interim bail. The trial is likely to take sometime to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars any further.

Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

March 13, 2020

savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No