

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-53697-2021
Date of Decision: 31.08.2023

Mandeep Singh @ Bhattu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Inderpreet Singh Kang, AAG, Punjab.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
239	16.09.2020	P.S. Gate Hakima Amritsar	Sections 21 & 29 of the NDPS Act & Section 25 of the Arms Act

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of aforementioned
FIR.
2. As per the case of the prosecution, the recovery of 300 grams of Heroin
was effected in the present case from the person of the petitioner which
falls within the category of commercial quantity under the NDPS Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has
falsely been implicated in the present case. It has further been submitted
that the petitioner has been behind bars for a substantial period of more

than 2 years, 11 months and 14 days and that since the trial is proceeding at snail’s pace, the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner was caught red handed at the spot and the commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from him, he does not deserve the concession of bail. He has also opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has already been convicted in case FIR No.58 dated 11.08.2013, under Section 21 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Sarai Amant Khan. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 2 years, 11 months and 14 days. It has also been informed that till date only 5 PWs out of cited 13 PWs have been examined.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions.
6. Since the petitioner seeks grant of bail mainly on account of long custody, it is apposite to refer to a few judgments of Hon’ble Supreme Court in this regard wherein Hon’ble Supreme Court has granted the concession of bail solely on ground of long custody:

Case No.	Date of Decision	Title of case	Period which the accused had undergone when granted bail by Hon’ble Supreme Court
Criminal Appeal No.245/2020	07.02.2020	Chitta Biswas @ Subhas Vs. The State of West Bengal	1 year & 7 months
Criminal Appeal No.668/2020	12.10.2020	Amit Singh Moni Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh	2 years & 7 months
Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) No.5769/2022	01.08.2022	Nitish Adhikary @ Bapan Vs. The State of West Bengal	1 year & 7 months
Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) No.4173/2022	04.08.2022	Shariful Islam @ Sarif Vs. The State of West Bengal	1 year & 6 months
Criminal Appeal No.1169/2022	05.08.2022	Gopal Krishna Patra @ Gopalrusma Vs. Union of	2 years, 1 month & 17 days

		India	
Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) No.5530/2022	22.08.2022	Mohammad Salman Hanif Shaikh Vs. The State of Gujarat	About 2 years
Criminal Appeal No.2027-2022	22.11.2022	Karnail Singh Vs. The State of Odisha	1 year & 8 months
Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) No.8653-2022	25.11.2022	Karim Adaldar Vs. The State of West Bengal	10 months

7. Hon’ble Supreme Court in yet another judgment dated 25.01.2023 arising out of **SLP No.6690-2022 titled Dheeraj Kumar Shukla Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh** has granted bail in a case registered under the NDPS Act where the accused alongwith co-accused was found in possession of ‘commercial’ quantity of *Ganja* and had been behind bars since the last two and a half years while observing that in the absence of any criminal antecedents, the conditions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act could be dispensed with at that stage, particularly when there was delay in conclusion of trial. Recently, the Hon’ble Supreme Court vide order dated 15.03.2023 passed in **SLP(Criminal) No.1166/2023 titled ‘Chet Ram @ Ram Veer Vs. Union of India’** has also granted bail to the accused on account of long custody, though he was also involved in another case under NDPS Act.
8. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case particularly the long custody of the petitioner i.e. about 2 years, 11 months and 14 days and the fact that only 5 PWs out of cited 13 PWs have been examined till date, the petition merits acceptance and is hereby accepted.
9. The petition, as such, is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the

CRM-M-53697-2021

2023:PHHC:114321

satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

10. It is, however, directed that in case the petitioner is found to be indulging in similar offence again, the prosecution would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail before this Court.

31.08.2023

dinesh

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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