



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

CRM-M-3470-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.10.2024

Charanjit Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.59, dated 17.04.2023, registered under Sections 15, 25 and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Dhanaula, District Barnala.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for 1 year and 6 months. Her name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused and the recovery of 10 kg Poppy Husk was effected from her. He alleges false implication. The mandatory provisions of Section 42 of NDPS Act were not complied with. No independent witness was joined at the time of recovery. Charges were framed on 21.10.2023, however, only 1 out of 18 prosecution witnesses has yet been examined. She is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act, except cases under Excise Act, wherein she is on bail. 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. Custody certificate dated 28.10.2024, filed by learned State counsel is taken on record, as per which, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year, 6 months and 4 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that pursuant to the disclosure statement of co-accused, 10 kg of poppy husk has been recovered from her. He is unable to controvert the submissions made regarding the stage of the case and the petitioner being enlarged on bail 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. Hon'ble the Supreme Court 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. 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 right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act. 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 **Munasi Masih vs. State of Punjab**, CRM-M-31504-2022, decided on 06.02.2023, this Court granted bail to a first offender from whom commercial quantity of contraband had been recovered and only 2 out of 13 PWs have been examined, by observing that in view of delayed trial, the rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act can be diluted to an extent and the petitioner can be granted bail, keeping in mind the right to a speedy trial as envisaged Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year, 6 months and 4 days; on bail in other cases; charges were framed on 21.10.2023, however, only 1 out of 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus her further incarceration would be violative of her right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors of Section 37 of 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 her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to her 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, she is an accused, or for commission of which she 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 her liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish her 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

29.10.2024
M.Kamra

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