

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(211)

CRM-M-41308-2021

Date of Decision : October 06, 2021

Vinit Rana alias Vanit Kumar

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

(Through Video Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No.61 dated 27.06.2020 registered under Sections 21, 22-61-85 of the NDPS Act and Section 473 IPC at Police Station Mullanpur Garibdass.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is only a Security Guard, who is working in PGI, Chandigarh and has no reasons to commit the crime. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is already behind the bars since 27.06.2020 and therefore, he be granted the benefit of regular bail.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, learned Deputy Advocate General,

Punjab, who has joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping

in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that in the present case, recovery of the contraband is huge and different types of banned substances have been recovered, which shows the intent of the petitioner and hence, keeping in view the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act, petitioner is not entitled for the grant of regular bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

From the facts detailed hereinbefore, it is clear that different kinds of banned substances have been recovered from the petitioner and that too in a huge quantity. The petitioner has not been able to explain as to how, the said banned substance came into his possession especially when an argument has been raised that the petitioner is working as a Security Guard in the PGI, Chandigarh. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner has not been able to cross the hurdles as imposed by Section 37 of the NDPS Act so as to seek the concession of bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of this case, no ground is made out to grant the petitioner the benefit of regular bail.

Dismissed.

It is made clear that nothing observed herein shall be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

October 06, 2021

harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No