

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

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M No.42500 of 2021  
Date of Decision: 14.10.2021**

**Jitender Kumar alias Raju**

**Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present: Mr. Ankit Chowdhri, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):**

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

This petition is filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.356, dated 08.05.2021, under Sections 17-B(E), 18-A, 18(a), 18(c), 27(B)(ii), 27(c), 28 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, Sections 3, 7 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 and Sections 420, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City 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 counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner only acted as a middleman. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 18.5.2021, 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 was supplier of Remdesivir injection. 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. Co-accused was granted bail by this Court. 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.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]**  
**JUDGE**

**14.10.2021**

*rittu*

|                               |   |        |
|-------------------------------|---|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable         | : | Yes/No |