

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

235

CRM-M-22384-2020
Date of Decision: 31.01.2023

Gurwinder Singh @ Rimpa

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Manpreet Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Virat Rana, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

After arguing for some time, counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be contended and satisfied if the trial is expedited.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that since prima facie the quantity of the drug is not commercial and the prosecution is wrong to said that it is commercial. He further submits that he be permitted to raise these points before the trial Court and the trial Court should specifically refer to the said arguments in the judgment.

Prayer is very genuine because in case, the quantity is commercial, then the maximum sentence imposable is 10 years, whereas, if the quantity is intermediate, then maximum becomes minimum. As such, the trial Court while passing the judgment refer to these arguments, if addressed.

Given above, the present petition is partly allowed. The trial Court to make efforts to complete the trial and pronounce the judgment on or before 30.04.2023. It is clarified that the petitioner shall not seek any adjournment. It is further clarified that in case, the trial is not completed by 30.04.2023 in that case, petitioner is permitted to file a fresh petition for bail before this Court and on that ground alone, this Court might consider to grant bail to the petitioner.

Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE**

31.01.2023
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable?

Yes/no
Yes/no