

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

221

CRM-M-36005-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.09.2023

Shampy Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. SS Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.42 dated 30.03.2021 registered under Sections 22 and 29 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Amargarh, District Malerkotla.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year and 10 months. His name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Mani Kaur. There is no other evidence to connect him to the said co-accused. No recovery has been effected from him. Though he is involved in two more cases, however, his sentence has been suspended. 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. He also relies on the order passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **Sandeep Kumar @ Gogi vs. State of Haryana** in CRM-M-24505-2022 decided on 07.12.2022, wherein also the petitioner was implicated on the basis of disclosure statement, no recovery had been

effected from him, he was involved in one more case under the NDPS Act. Charges were framed on 31.03.2022, however, only 4 witnesses, out of 17 have been examined.

3. The custody certificate dated 05.09.2023, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year, 10 months and 15 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from co-accused of the petitioner and in her disclosure statement, she had specifically named the petitioner with the allegations that contraband was supplied by him. He is however unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the stage of the case and petitioner's sentence being suspended in other cases.

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. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year, 10 months and 15 days; name surfaced on the disclosure statement of co-accused; no recovery has been effected from him; sentence has been suspended in other two cases; charges were framed on 31.03.2022 and out of 17 witnesses, only 4 have been examined so far; the trial is likely to take a

considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

06.09.2023
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No