

126.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31533-2019

Date of decision: 12.03.2021

GURPREET SINGH @ BUNTY ... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB Respondent

II. CRM-M-32679-2019

JASPREET SINGH @ JASSI ... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-31533-2019.

Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate, for
Mr. Ramandeep Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-32679-2019.

Mr. Avtar Singh Sandhu, Additional Advocate General, Punjab

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of two petitions i.e. **CRM-M-31533-2019** titled as ***Gurpreet Singh @ Buntty Versus State of Punjab*** and **CRM-M-32679-2019** titled as ***Jaspreet Singh @ Jassi Versus State of Punjab***.

Prayer in both these petitions filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is
for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case FIR No.106 dated

07.05.2019 registered under Section 22 of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Mandi Gobindgarh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

The aforesaid FIR was registered on 07.05.2019. As per FIR, 14 injections each of Buprenorphine intoxicant were recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Each injection contains 2 ML. The recovered contraband was without any permit or licence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that there is no other case against the petitioner except the present one. The petitioner- Jaspreet Singh alias Jassi is in custody for about 01 year, 9 months and 24 days, whereas Gurpreet Singh alias Bunty is in custody for about 1 year, 10 months and 1 day. No other case has been pointed out against them.

Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate(s) of the petitioner(s), which are taken on record. He does not dispute the custody.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Considering the fact that the petitioner(s) are in custody for about 1 year and 10 months and as against 14 witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 3 witnesses have been examined so far, this Court finds that trial in the case will take long time.

Taking into consideration the custody and the fact that no other case has been pointed out against the petitioner(s), this Court deems it appropriate to admit the petitioner(s) on bail.

Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioner(s) are admitted on regular bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

It is made clear that the petitioner(s) shall not cause delay in the trial and in case it is found that the petitioner(s) are involved in any other case, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of their bail.

The observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

12.03.2021
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No