

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-10302-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 06.12.2022

PARMESHWAR SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

The 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.175 dated 03.12.2020, under Sections 22 and 29 of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station Shambu, District Patiala.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last little over two years. He submits that there is non-compliance of Sections 42 and 50 of the NDPS Act in the present case. He submits that charges have been framed, however, only 02 out of 18 witnesses have been examined. Learned counsel relies on the order of Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of Rahim Mondal and another Vs. The State of West Bengal, in a case of commercial quantity in view of custody of more than 02 years, wherein 3 out of 8-9 witnesses had been examined, bail has been granted.

Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate dated 05.12.2022, which is taken on record.

Opposing the bail, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner was apprehended at the spot along with his brother who was found in possession of commercial quantity of contraband. He further submits that the petitioner is involved in two other FIR, however not under the NDPS Act. He is not unable to controvert that the petitioner is in custody for 02years; charges have been framed and in all there 18 are witnesses out of whom only 02 have been examined.

Heard.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody since last two years; charges have been framed; only 02 out of 18 witnesses have been examined; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, his further detention behind bars would not serve any useful purpose, thus the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

As a result, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to him not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

1. The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
2. The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
3. The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
4. The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
5. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
6. The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
7. Any infraction shall entail in withdrawal of the benefit granted by

this Court.

- 8. The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number to the Trial Court forthwith and shall not change the same till the conclusion of the trial and in case for any reason, the petitioner seeks to change any of the aforesaid, the same shall be done only with prior intimation to the learned Trial Court, stating the reason for the same.
- 9. The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the Trial Court forthwith and in case, he does not have the passport, he shall furnish a specific affidavit in this regard.

It is made clear that in case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

In view of the above, this Court makes it clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

December 06, 2022
S.Sharma(syr)

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No