

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

DECIDED ON: 27th August, 2021

(1) CRM-M-23676 of 2021

Lachmi Bai @ Laxmi Bai

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....RESPONDENT

(2) CRM-M-27337 of 2021

Surinder Singh @ Chhinda

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Paras Jhamb, Advocate and Mr. Mohit Sadana, Advocate
for petitioners in CRM-M-23676-2021.

Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for petitioner
in CRM-M-27337-2021.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The matter is taken up for hearing through video conference due to
COVID-19 situation.

These two petitions under Section 439 Cr.P.C. are filed seeking
regular bail in case of FIR No.42 dated 16.3.2020, under Sections 22 & 29 of
NDPS Act and Section 420, 389 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station
City Jalalabad, District Fazilka.

FIR was registered at the instance of Sandeep Singh @ Deepa.
As per the contents of FIR, complainant while cleaning desert cooler found
820 tablets of Tramadol. As per the complainant, accused named in the
FIR including Lachmi Bai @ Laxmi Bai, mother-in-law of complainant

planted the tablets in the deserted cooler as there was a matrimonial dispute. During investigation, a disclosure statement was suffered by Lachmi Bai @ Laxmi Bai stating that accused Surinder Singh @ Chhinda was the supplier of the tablets.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the story put forth is improbable. It is a case of false implication. No recovery was effected from the petitioners. The FIR is only a tool to harass the in-laws as there is a matrimonial dispute.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions, opposes the prayer for bail. She submits that Surinder Singh @ Chhinda is not having clean antecedent as he is involved in atleast five more cases under NDPS Act. She futher submits that challan is yet to be presented.

No recovery was made from the petitioners. Matrimonial dispute is there between the parties. Completion of investigation and conclusion of trial are likely to take time, the petitioners are granted bail on furnishing surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petitions are allowed.

It is clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

27th August, 2021
reema

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes</i>