

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**CRM-M-726-2023 (O & M)****Date of decision: 30.01.2023**

Gurpreet Kaur @ Kali

.... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.146 dated 30.03.2022 under Sections 304, 328 IPC and Section 21 of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station City Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the statement of Kaur Singh son of Sand Singh was recorded to the effect that he had two sons and one daughter. His elder son-Daljit Singh @ Dalli was married. He was a drug addict. When he (complainant) came to know this fact, he tried to make him (deceased) understand and enquire about the intoxicants. Daljit Singh @ Dalli disclosed that Bhupinder Singh @ Bhinda, Raja Singh, Gagandeep Singh @ Ganja, Amar Singh, Happy Singh and Sikander Singh, all of them used to administer drugs to the drug-addicts with the syringe. Even he (deceased-Daljit Singh) was administered drug doses by them many times.

SUKHPREET KAUR Thereafter, he (complainant) and his family members requested the above-
2023.01.31 10:08
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

named persons not to administer drug doses to Daljit Singh (deceased) However, they did not mend their ways. On 29.03.2022, his (complainant's) son left the house for taking the medicine but did not return back. On a search being conducted, it was discovered that Daljit Singh @ Dalli had died on account of over-dose of drugs and his body was found at General Hospital, Dabwali on 30.03.2022. His (complainant's) son had died due to heavy dose of drugs given by the aforementioned accused. The motor cycle of his son was missing and was also to be traced.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and no specific role has been attributed to her. Her name has figured in the disclosure statement of her co-accused Amritpal Singh @ Amar Singh.

The co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Amritpal Singh @ Amar Singh has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 24.08.2022. Two named co-accused, namely, Raja Singh and Bhupinder Singh @ Bhinda have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 21.11.2022 passed in CRM-M-31785-2022 and 28.09.2022 passed in CRM-M-18731-2022 respectively. Two co-accused, namely, Maskin Singh and Amandeep Singh, who were named in the disclosure statement of accused-Amritpal Singh @ Amar Singh, have been granted bail vide orders dated 12.12.2022 passed in CRM-M-46843-2022 and 21.10.2022 passed in CRM-M-48217-2022 respectively, whereas co-accused/Beant Kaur has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 21.11.2022 passed in CRM-M-35390-2022. He, thus, contends that as the co-accused of the petitioner have been granted the concession of either anticipatory bail or regular bail, the

since 03.07.2022 and none of the 16 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that 04 syringes have been recovered from the petitioner. Therefore, she did not deserve the concession of bail. He, however, does not dispute the fact that the co-accused of the petitioner have been granted the concession of either anticipatory bail or regular bail. He also admits the period of custody undergone by the petitioner as also the stage of the Trial.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner is named in the disclosure statement of her co-accused-Amritpal Singh @ Amar Singh, who has been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 24.08.2022 (Annexure P-3). The evidentiary value of the said disclosure statement shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. The petitioner is in custody since 03.07.2022 and none of the 16 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Besides, the petitioner is a lady. As such, her further incarceration is not required.

6. In view of the above, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Gurpreet Kaur @ Kali, is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. The petitioner shall appear on the first Monday of every month before the police station concerned till the conclusion of the trial and furnish an affidavit each time that she is not involved in any case other than the present one.

8. In addition, the petitioner (or someone on her behalf) shall

Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

January 30, 2023
sukhpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No