

(227) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31504-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.02.2023

MUNASI MASIH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shubham Kaushik, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.147 dated 22.11.2020 registered under Section 22 of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Sadar Abohar, District Fazilka, Punjab.

2. The brief facts of the case are that while the police party was on patrolling duty and present at Village Sadewala, then a secret informer informed the party that Munish Masih (petitioner) and Anwar Masih who were in the possession of one Trolla bearing NoPB05V-0779 were in the habit of selling intoxicating tablets after getting them on cheap rates from Rajasthan and would sell them at higher rates in Punjab. They would be coming from Ganga Nagar towards Abohar after loading the intoxicating tablets in the trolla and if a *Nakabandi* was set up, they could be apprehended along with the intoxicating tablets.

Based on the said information, an FIR was registered and a *Nakabandi* was set up. Thereafter, the search of the truck lead to the recovery of 10,000 tablets make Corlividol-100 SR.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. No independent witness or any Gazetted Officer or Magistrate was joined in the police party. The mandatory provisions of Sections 42, 50 and 52 of NDPS Act have not been complied with. Since the petitioner was in custody since 22.11.2020 and was a first-time offender, he was entitled to the concession of regular bail keeping in view the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Nitish Adhikary @ Bapan Versus The State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) Nos.5769/2022 arising out of judgment and order dated 04.05.2022 in CRM(NDPS) No.442/2022, decided on 01.08.2022* and followed by this Court in the case of *Balraj Singh Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-57386-2022, decided on 14.12.2022.*

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the petitioner. 02 out of the 13 prosecution witnesses already stand examined. Therefore, the petitioner was not entitled to the grant of regular bail. He, however, does not dispute the custody period undergone by the petitioner as also the fact that the petitioner is a first-time offender.

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

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Nitish Adhikary @ Bapan Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) Nos.5769/2022 Decided on 01.08.2022* held as under:-

“As per the office report dated 29.07.2022, copy of the show cause notice along with Special Leave Petition was supplied to the Standing Counsel for the State of West Bengal and separate notice has been served on the State also. However, no one has entered appearance on their behalf.

The petitioner seeks enlargement on bail in F.I.R. No. 612 of 2020 dated 17.10.2020 filed under Section 21(c) and 37 of the NDPS 2 Act, registered at Police Station Bongaon, West Bengal.

During the course of the hearing, we are informed that the petitioner has undergone custody for a period of 01 year and 07 months as on 09.06.2022. The trial is at a preliminary stage, as only one witness has been examined. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents.

Taking into consideration the period of sentence undergone by the petitioner and all the attending circumstances but without expressing any views in the merits of the case, we are inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

The petitioner is accordingly, directed to be released on bail subject to him furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

The Special Leave Petition is disposed of on the aforestated terms.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

This Court in the case of **Balraj Singh Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-57386-2022, decided on 14.12.2022** has followed the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and granted bail to the petitioner therein after he had undergone total custody of 01 year and 06 months.

7. In the present case, the petitioner is a first-time offender and in custody since 22.11.2020. Only 02 out of the 13 prosecution witnesses have

been examined so far. As such, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In view of the delayed Trial, the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be diluted to an extent and the petitioner can be granted bail keeping in mind the right to a speedy Trial as envisaged under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

8. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Munasi Masih son of Balkar Masih is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the present case.

10. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.2,00,000/- and deposit the same with the 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.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)

JUDGE

06.02.2023

JITESH

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