

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

CRM-M-42136-2023

Date of Decision:-31.08.2023

Sandeep Singh @ Sonu.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Munish Puri, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.16 dated 06.03.2023 under Sections 21/61/85 of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station Taragrah, District Pathankot.

2. The brief facts of the case are that while the police party was on patrolling duty, one person was seen coming on foot from the side of village Parmanand. On seeing the police party he got nervous and tried to turn back. He was apprehended and disclosed his name as Sandeep Singh @ Sonu (petitioner). After complying with the provisions of the Act regarding search and seizure, the recovery of 255 grams of Heroin was effected from the transparent polythene bag which was in the right hand pocket of the trouser of the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner has been in custody since 06.03.2023 and 02 of the 10 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the trial of the present case was not

likely to be concluded anytime soon. Even otherwise, as the recovery from the petitioner was marginally above the commercial quantity of 250 grams of Heroin, the petitioner was entitled to the grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the petitioner. Therefore, he was not entitled to the concession of bail in view of the bar contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is a first time offender, in custody since 06.03.2023 and only 02 of the 10 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far.

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

6. In the cases of '*Sukhchain Singh @ Manga Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-7857-2022 decided on 04.04.2022, Pardeep Singh versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-46244-2022 decided on 19.01.2023, Hari Yadav @ Haiya versus State of Punjab (CRM-M-37645-2021)*' decided on 11.11.2022, '*Jang Kanwar Versus State of Punjab (CRM-M-53415-2021)*' decided on 19.01.2022, '*Shankar Prashad Chanau Versus The State of Punjab, CRM-M-24090-2020, decided on 27.08.2020, Gurpreet Kumar Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-17021-2021, decided on 31.08.2021, Salim Versus State of Haryana, CRM-M-42436-2020, decided on 24.02.2021, Gagandeep Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-3055-2021, decided on 27.01.2021, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M41039-2019, decided on 26.02.2020, Dalbara Singh Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-47880-2022 decided on 16.01.2023*', and '*Vivek Watts versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-13791-2022 decided on 15.02.2023*', where the recovery from the accused was marginally above the commercial quantity for the respective contraband in each case, the Court granted bail to the accused therein.

7. In the present case, the alleged recovery from the petitioner is 255 grams of Heroin, which is marginally above the commercial quantity of 250 grams. In this situation, the provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be relaxed to an extent and the case of the petitioner can be considered for the grant of bail, moreso, when he is in custody since 06.03.2023 and 02 of the 10 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

8. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Sandeep Singh @ Sonu** son of **Sh. Jaswant Singh** is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the

Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear on the first Monday of every month before the police station concerned till the conclusion of the trial and furnish an affidavit each time that he is not involved in any other case other than the present case.
10. In addition, the petitioner (or someone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- 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

August 31, 2023
Vinay

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