

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

CRM-M-30537 of 2021

DECIDED ON: 13th September, 2021

Sanam Vohra

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. R.S. Rai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Anurag Arora, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking regular bail in case of FIR No.356 dated 8.5.2021, under Sections 18-A, 18(c), 27(b)(ii), 28 Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Section 3, 7 of Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (added lateron Section 17B(e), 18(a)(i), 27(c) Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Sections 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Yamuna Nagar City, District Yamuna Nagar.

The allegation in the FIR is that duplicate Remdesivir injections were supplied by the petitioner at a price higher than the MRP.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was only acting as a middleman. He purchased the injection from co-accused Gurmeet Singh and charged his commission. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 9.5.2021, investigation is complete and no recovery is to be effected. The contention is that no injection was recovered from the petitioner.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that it is a crime against humanity. When the world was facing the Pandemic situation, in which the person like the petitioner was out to encash the situation. She on instructions submits that the challan stands presented and investigation is complete.

Co-accused Gurmeet Singh is supplier of Remdesivir injection. The Court is informed that the manufacturer is also in custody. Recovery from the petitioner is of Rs.1000/-. Investigation is complete, conclusion of trial is likely to take time. Petitioner is not involved in any other case. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars. Bail is granted to the petitioner on furnishing surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed.

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

13th September, 2021

reema

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE**

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