

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

CRM-M-20273-2022

Date of Decision: 19th May, 2022

Jora Gill @ Jori

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. V.B. Godara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

This petition is filed seeking regular bail in case of FIR No.3 dated 4.1.2021, under Sections 22-C, 27-A, 29, 61 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, (for short 'the Act') registered at Police Station Sadar Tohana, District Fatehabad.

As per the case set up, on 4.1.2021 police party apprehended Ajay Kumar alias Hoshiyara while he was riding on motor cycle bearing registration No. HR-23-J-0876 and 700 strips of Tramadol Hydrochloride tablets were recovered from him. Ravi Dutt alias Raman was named by Ajay Kumar as supplier of recovered tablets. Ravi Dutt alias Raman in his disclosure named Jora Gill @ Jori (petitioner).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was named in a disclosure statement, no recovery was made from him. The petitioner is in custody since 11.1.2022 and investigation is complete. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks parity with co- accused Ravi Dutt

alias Raman who was granted bail by this Court vide order dated 21.4.2022.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and submits that apart from the disclosure statement there are call details between the petitioner and Ravi Dutt alias Raman who had supplied the recovered tablets. He further submits that recovery from the co-accused was of heavy quantity.

Petitioner's name surfaced in disclosure statement. Evidentiary value of the call detail between the petitioner and Ravi Dutt alias Raman as well as of disclosure statement would be subject matter of trial. The co-accused was granted bail, albeit investigation is complete and conclusion of trial is likely to take time, 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

19th May, 2022
anuradha

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