

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.9348 of 2021

Date of Decision: 04.03.2021

Uday

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Deepak Kundu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, DAG, Punjab.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (Oral)

This is third petition for grant of bail pending trial in criminal case arising from FIR No. 67, dated 20.07.2019, registered under Section 22 of Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station STF Phase-4, District Mohali.

While dismissing the second petition on 09.11.2020, the following order was passed:-

“This is second petition for grant of regular bail pending trial in a criminal case arising from FIR No. 67, dated 20.07.2019, registered under Section 22/61/85 of the Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1985 Act”), at Police Station STF Phase-4, S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali.

The first petition was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 18.11.2019. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner was apprehended with 700 ampules of Buprenorphine and 250 ampules of Phenergan and both contained prohibited substances. Still further, from reading of para 13 of the petition, it is apparent that two more FIRs are pending against the petitioner, details whereof, are as under:-

*a) FIR No. 186 dated 03.07.2019,
registered under Section 22 and 29 of the*

Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station Bhawanigarh, Sangrur, Punjab.

b) FIR No. 86 dated 18.07.2019, registered under Section 22 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station Chhajli, Sangrur, Punjab.

The alleged recovery from the petitioner falls in commercial quantity.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that due to the spread of COVID-19 pandemic and consequent restricted functioning of the Courts, the trial of the case has not any progress.

This Court has considered the submissions. The petitioner is involved in as many as three cases, as per the information supplied by learned counsel for the petitioner. The alleged recovery from the petitioner is also of huge quantity.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Hence, the present petition is dismissed. However, the trial Court is directed to make efforts for the expeditious disposal of the case.”

Although, learned counsel for the petitioner makes sincere attempt, however, failed to draw attention of the Court to any fresh ground for bail.

The petition is dismissed.

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

04.03.2021
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No