

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

219

CRM-M-6087-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.08.2023

Vijay Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Ajay Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Virk, Sr. DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.57 dated 18.03.2021, registered under Section 22 (c) of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for 2 years and about 4 months. He alleges false implication. The mandatory provisions of Sections 42 and 50 of NDPS Act were not complied with. Though the charges were framed on 29.09.2021, however, out of 13 prosecution witnesses, 6 have been examined. The petitioner is involved in one more case, wherein he was granted bail vide order dated 14.12.2017 and the recovery in the said case was of 34gms Heroin. In this regard, reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble The Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 29.08.2023 has been filed by learned State counsel. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 2 years, 3 months and 25 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner was apprehended at the spot and the commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case as also that the petitioner is on bail in another case.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "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."

7. Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in the case of **Dheeraj Kumar Shukla vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh**, SLP (Criminal) No.6690/2022 decided on 25.01.2023 observed that in a case of long custody period, involving quantity recovered to be of commercial nature, where the trial is yet to commence, though charges had been framed, the condition of Section 37 of NDPS Act can be dispensed with. Similarly, in the case of **Shariful Islam @ Sarif vs. The State of West Bengal** SLP (Crl.) No.4173/2022, decided on 04.08.2022, Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India granted bail to the petitioner in a case of recovery of commercial quantity of contraband, considering incarceration for over 1 year and 6 months and there being no likelihood of completion of trial in the near future. In

the case of **Bhupender Singh vs. Narcotic Control Bureau** (2022) 2 RCR (Crl.) 706, the Division Bench of this Court observed with regard to achieving balance between right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act. This Court in the case of **Balraj Singh vs. State of Punjab** CRM-M-57386-2022, decided on 14.12.2022 has followed the dictum laid down by Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India and granted bail to the petitioner therein after he had undergone total custody of 1 year and 6 months.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 2 years, 3 months and 25 days; on bail in another case; charges stand framed wayback on 29.09.2021, however, only 6 out of 13 prosecution witnesses, have been examined so far; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act can be diluted bearing in mind the right to a speedy trial, thus, the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

9. 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 his not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.

- (iv) 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.
- (v) 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.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) 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.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

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

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

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

August 31, 2023
M.Kamra

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