

CRM-M-35091-2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-35091-2023
Date of decision: 07.11.2023

CHARANJIT SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present:- Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. G.S.Sandhu, DAG, Punjab.

RAJBIR SEHRAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of bail pending trial in case FIR No.182 dated 19.07.2022, registered under Section 22 NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 27 NDPS Act added later on), at Police Station Sadar Mansa, District Mansa.
2. It is submitted by the counsel for the petitioner that the case against the petitioner is totally concocted and fabricated. The petitioner is not involved in the crime at all. Even as per the case of the prosecution, the alleged recovery from the petitioner is of 3000 tablets of contraband. However, the said recovery is totally fabricated. Even the recovery memo does not contain the signatures of the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 21.07.2022. The investigation of the case is already over. The petitioner is not required for any investigation purposes. There are 14 witnesses and only 03 witnesses have been examined so far. There is no other case registered against the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner deserves

CRM-M-35091-2023

to be released on bail pending trial. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of *Nitish Adhikary @ Bapan Vs. The State of West Bengal* vide order dated 01.08.2022 passed in *SLP (Criminal) No.5769-2022; Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 AIR (Supreme Court) 1648* and another judgment rendered in *Md. Hasanuzzaman Vs. State of West Bengal & Ors, SLP (Crl.) No.3221 of 2023* vide order dated 04.05.2023, to buttress his arguments.

3. On the other hand, learned State Counsel, on instructions from ASI Amrik Singh, submits that a huge recovery of contraband has been effected from the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. However, it is not disputed that out of 14 witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far. It is also not disputed that there is no other case against the petitioner and that the petitioner is in custody since 21.07.2022.

4. In view the above, but without expressing any further opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

07.11.2023

parveen kumar

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No