

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51387-2022

Date of decision : 14.11.2022

Sumit Kumar @ Shambhu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Ravi Rana, Advocate and
Mr.Ashok Giri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

This is a first petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR no.227 dated 17.08.2022 registered under Sections 21B of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985 (in short "NDPS Act") (Section 29 NDPS Act added later on) at Police Station Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that neither the petitioner has been named in the FIR nor apprehended at the spot and the recovery from the co-accused of the petitioner is of 10 grams of heroin which is far less than the commercial quantity which starts from 250 grams. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been implicated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. The petitioner has been in custody since 23.08.2022 and the investigation is complete and the challan has already been presented and there are 10 witnesses, out of which, none have been

examined and thus, the trial is likely to take time.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the present petition for regular bail and has submitted that the petitioner is involved in three other cases under the NDPS Act and an amount of Rs.12,80,000/- was recovered from co-accused Sunil Kumar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, in rebuttal, has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***“Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and another”***, reported as ***2012 (2) SCC 382*** to contend that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other cases. The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc.”

This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paper book.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances moreso, the fact that recovery in the present case effected from the co-accused is of non-commercial quantity and also the fact that petitioner has been in custody since 23.08.2022 and the investigation is complete and the challan has already been presented and there are 10 witnesses, out of which, none have been examined and thus, the trial is likely to take time and no

law laid down in *Maulana's* case (supra), the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail / surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate and subject to him not being required in any other case.

However, it is made clear that in case, any act is done by the petitioner to threaten or influence the complainant or any of the witnesses, then it would be open to the State to move an application for cancellation of bail granted to the petitioner.

Nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

November 14, 2022
Davinder Kumar

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