

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

231

CRM-M-36117-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.08.2023

Jagjit Singh @ Jagga

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Prateek Pandit , Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Aditya Kapoor, AAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.156 dated 09.06.2017, registered under Section 22 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last about 3 years and 9 months. The alleged recovery effected from the petitioner is marginally above non-commercial quantity, it being 110 grams of Alprazolam. He submits that the mandatory provisions of Section 50 of the NDPS Act have not been complied with. Charges were framed on 09.02.2021, however, only 5 out of 9 witnesses have been examined. There is only one more case under the NDPS Act pending against the petitioner, wherein he has been granted bail and the recovery was effected from co-accused Ratan Kaur, on whose disclosure statement, he was falsely implicated. 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 01.08.2023 filed by learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 3 years 8 months and 28 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the petitioner, who was arrested at the spot. He was convicted in one case, though he has undergone the sentence of 8 months and he is involved in one more case under the NDPS Act. He is however unable to controvert the submissions regarding the stage of the case and petitioner being granted bail in another case.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India 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 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 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 the right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 3 years 8 months and 28 days; on bail in another FIR; though charges stand framed on 09.02.2021, however, only 5 out of 9 witnesses have yet been examined; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, 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 the 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 him 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

02.08.2023

S.Sharma(syr)

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