

217 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49472-2019
Date of decision-16.01.2020

Ranjit Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. R.V.S.Chugh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Prabhjot Singh Walia, AAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner-Ranjit Singh has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.254 dated 13.12.2018 registered under Sections 22 and 61 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 13.12.2018.

On 13.12.2018, when the Police party was on patrol duty at Maur Bus Stand Road, at about 7.30 p.m., one person, namely, Ranjit Singh @ Bunty (petitioner) alongwith his wife-Charanjit Kaur @ Charno was standing near the bushes on Mansa road. Charnjit Kaur was carrying a black coloured polythene bag. On suspicion, they were apprehended and on checking the said polythene bag, 400 tablets of Carisoprodol, 100 tablets of AT-TWO 2 mg, one vial of Onerex and 3 vials of Wincirex were recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner

was arrested on 13.12.2018 and during trial, prosecution has examined only two witnesses. Learned counsel while referring to the said statements (Annexure P-2) has argued that there are material discrepancies in the prosecution case and considering the custody, further detention of the petitioner may not be justified. It is further pointed out that co-accused of the petitioner has already been released on bail vide order dated 26.11.2019.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Dharminder Pal opposed the prayer. According to him, only two witnesses have been examined so far. In respect of the discrepancies, it is argued that the other material collected during investigation would render the alleged discrepancies as meaningless.

Considering the above background, custody of the petitioner who is in custody since 13.12.2018 and the fact that the trial is likely to consume considerable time, this Court is of the opinion that further detention of the petitioner may not be justified. Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

16.01.2020

vanita

**(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes	No
Yes	No