

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

CRM-M-50774-2019

Date of decision-30.01.2020

Pritam Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. D.S.Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, DAG, Haryana.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner-Pritam Singh has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.272 dated 07.08.2018 registered under Sections 22 and 61 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 01.10.2019.

As per the prosecution case, on 07.08.2018, when the Police party was on patrol duty, at village Kaluana to Bachar, one car was seen and on suspicion, the vehicle was signalled to stop. On seeing the police, they tried to run away and four persons from the said car managed to escape. However, one person, namely, Pritam (petitioner) who was sitting at the back seat was apprehended. Upon search, 2900 capsules and tablets containing Tramadol Parvoinspax Ridley and Tramadol Trio-SR were recovered from the compartment of the car.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the interim regular bail was extended to the petitioner vide order dated 09.01.2019 as

the FSL report was awaited. Upon presentation of the said report, the petitioner was taken in custody on 01.10.2019 and the said concession was never put to any misuse. It is pointed out that the investigation of the case is complete and the charges were framed on 15.11.2019. However, only two witnesses have been examined so far out of 16 witnesses. He submits that petitioner is not involved in any other case.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Chandan Singh, though opposed the bail, but has not disputed the above facts. He further submits that the petitioner was one of the occupants of the vehicle where from the alleged contraband was recovered. The said vehicle belongs to Manish. It is further pointed out that the co-accused, Sandeep who is similarly situated has been granted the concession of regular bail.

Considering the above background and the fact that trial is likely to consume considerable time, this Court is of the opinion that further detention of the petitioner may not be justified, particularly when he is not involved in any other case, muchless of the similar nature. 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.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

30.01.2020

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No