

CRM-19807-2022 in/and
CRR-1289-2020 (O&M)

1

120

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-19807-2022 in/and
CRR-1289-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:30.05.2022

MANPREET SINGH @ PREET (MINOR)

.. Applicant/Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate for applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

CRM-19807-2022

The instant application is for pre-poning the date of hearing of the main petition to an early date.

Notice in the application.

At this stage, Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and does not oppose the prayer.

Application is allowed and the date of hearing is pre-poned to today.

CRR-1289-2020 (O&M)

The petitioner being aggrieved against the decision dated 10.11.2020 passed by the Appellate Court in Criminal Appeal No.2 dated 29.10.2020, whereby the order dated 22.10.2020 passed by Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Mansa refusing his release on bail in

case FIR No.146 dated 08.10.2020, registered under Sections 22C/25/29/61/85 NDPS Act, at Police Station Joga, District Mansa, was upheld.

As per prosecution, the petitioner was found in possession of 2000 tablets (200 strips each containing 10 tablets) of TM-100-SR without any permit or licence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that since his arrest on 08.10.2020, the petitioner is in custody and he is not involved in any other case. He states that charges have been framed on 09.04.2020, but only seven prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total fifteen prosecution witnesses so far. He prays for bail.

Learned State counsel, assisted by ASI Jasbir Singh has opposed the prayer on the ground that the petitioner was carrying 2000 tablets in his possession when he was arrested and a case is also registered against his father under NDPS Act and the alleged quantity recovered from the petitioner falls within the ambit of commercial quantity. However, it is not disputed that after framing of charges on 09.04.2020, only seven prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total fifteen prosecution witnesses so far.

Considering the above background and custody of the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that the conclusion of trial is likely to consume considerable time, as only seven prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total fifteen prosecution witnesses so far, therefore, further detention of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose, who is presently confined in judicial custody after his arrest.

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the

merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail in the above case, subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Appellate Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed.

30.05.2022
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No