



CRM-M-8201-2024

-1-

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

206

CRM-M-8201-2024

Date of decision: 10.07.2024

Lakhwinder Singh alias Bittu

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. PS Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.38, dated 12.03.2023, registered under Sections 22 and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Kot Ise Khan, District Moga.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for about 1 year. His name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Harmeet Singh alias Neeta. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. He relies upon judgment passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of **Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, 2021 (1) RCR (Crl.) 1. Charges were framed on 26.10.2023, however, only 2 out of 14 prosecution witnesses have been yet examined. He also relies on the order passed by this Court in **Sandeep Kumar @ Gogi vs. State of Haryana** in CRM-M-24505-2022 decided on 07.12.2022, wherein the petitioner was granted bail after a



custody of almost 9 months, on his having implicated on the basis of disclosure statement and no recovery had been effected from him. The petitioner is involved in 3 more cases under the NDPS, 2 out of which are of non-commercial quantity and one of commercial, wherein he 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. The custody certificate dated 09.07.2024 has been filed by learned State counsel, which is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 11 months and 21 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that co-accused, from whom the commercial quantity was recovered, specifically named the petitioner in his disclosure statement, who is involved in 3 more cases under the NDPS Act. He is however unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case and the petitioner being on bail in the 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. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular



that the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 21 days; no recovery effected from him; is on bail in other cases under the NDPS Act; charges were framed on 26.10.2023; only 2 out of 14 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, thus his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

8. 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 his 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.

9. 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.

10. 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

10.07.2024
hemant

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