

**CRM-M-54261-2021 &
CRM-M-9177-2022**

-1-

218+228

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

Decided on: 9th March, 2022

1. CRM-M-54261-2021

Palwinder Singh

Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

Respondent

2. CRM-M-9177-2022

Princess Chinoye

Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-54261-2021.

Mr. Tarun Singhal, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-9177-2022.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

[1] Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.

[2] These two petitions are filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 125, dated 8th August, 2021 under Sections 21 and 25 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 [for short 'the Act'], registered at Police Station Doraha, District Khanna/Ludhiana.

[3] Brief facts of the case are that on 8th August, 2021 at about 12:50 PM, the police party checked a car bearing registration

No. DL01-ZD-1068. The car was being driven by Palwinder Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-54261-2021), Princess Chinoye (petitioner in CRM-M-9177-2022) was the occupant of the car. From the back seat of the car, 1 kilogram and 200 grams of heroin was recovered.

[4] Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh, learned counsel appearing for Palwinder Singh submits that he was taxi driver. The occupant had hired the taxi, no recovery was made from him.

[5] Mr. Tarun Singhal, learned counsel appearing for Princess Chinoye submits that she is in custody since 8th August, 2021, none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined. He further submits that there is prayer for interim bail on the ground of COVID-19.

[6] Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that both the accused were in connivance. There is statement of Palwinder Singh that he used to bring contraband for delivery in Punjab. He relies upon Section 37 of the Act stating that recovery is commercial in nature.

[7] After arguing the matters and realizing that the contentions raised are not finding favour of the Court, learned counsel for the petitioners seek permission to withdraw the present petitions at this stage.

[8] Dismissed as withdrawn.

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

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

9th March, 2022

pankaj baweja

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