

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-21224-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 06.05.2024

PARMINDER SINGH ALIAS BAAZ

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Vikramjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

CRM-18492-2024

Heard.

Leaved granted.

CRM-M-21224-2024

1. Through the instant petition, the petitioner craves for indulgence of this Court for his being enlarged on regular bail, in case FIR No.228, dated 13.12.2023, under Section 21(b), 27-A and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Dinanagar, District Gurdaspur, Punjab.
2. The brief facts of the case, which are culled out by the learned Judge, Special Court, Gurdaspur, while declining the regular bail application of the present petitioner, reads as under:-

“6. As per the case of the prosecution, on 13.12.2023 in the area of

Sugar Mill Paniar, three persons were intercepted by police party during patrolling duty who were coming on car bearing no. PB- 06-AJ-7885. They on seeing the police become perplexed and were apprehended on suspicion. On inquiry, the driver of car disclosed his name as Surinderjit Singh @ Vicky whereas the persons who were sitting in car disclosed their names as Jugraj Snigh and Parminder Snigh. On search, 10 grams heroin alongwith drugs money of Rs. 10500/- was recovered from the dashboard of car. They were arrested and since then applicant is in custody.”

3. In asking for the relief (supra), learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it transpires from the FIR (supra), that the recovery which was effected from the present petitioner, is of 10 grams of heroin. Though Rs.10,500/- was also recovered from the dashboard of the car, but it is a debatable issue, whether, the same is drug money or not.

4. He further submits that the petitioner has suffered sufficient incarceration of more than 4 months, as on today, and further the conclusion of the trial will take a long time.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vociferously opposed the asked for relief, and has placed on record the custody certificate *qua* the petitioner, which is taken on record. A perusal of the same reflects that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 4 months and 21 days as on today, and though he is involved in one more case, but in that case he has earned acquittal.

6. He further, on instructions imparted to him by the police official, informs this Court that the instant matter is still under investigation, and the final report is yet to be filed by the investigating agency.

7. This Court has heard the learned counsel for both the parties concerned, and has gone through the entire case file.

8. Be that as it may, considering the fact that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 4 months and 21 as on today, and the trial is yet to start, as final report has yet not been filed, this Court deems it fit and appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on furnishing of his bail bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of concerned Chief Judicial Magistrate/trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. However, it is clarified that if in future, the petitioner is found indulging in commission of similar offences, as are involved herein, the respondent-State shall be at liberty to make an appropriate application seeking cancellation of regular bail, as granted by this Court. Moreover, anything observed here-in-above shall have no effect on the merits of the trial and is meant for deciding the present petition only.

06.05.2024
amandeep

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No