



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

229

CRM-M-22622-2024

Date of decision: 14.05.2024

Ranjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner in the instant (fourth) petition is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.303 dated 18.09.2022 under Sections 22, 25, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'the NDPS Act') registered at Police Station Dera Bassi, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no doubt it is his fourth petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., however, the trial has not concluded even though charges were framed on 06.06.2023 and ever since then only 06 prosecution witnesses out of the 17 have been examined. It has been further submitted that the petitioner being innocent and having been falsely implicated in the present case is evident from the fact that he has no criminal antecedents much less any case under the NDPS Act and on the fateful day the petitioner was just



CRM-M-22622-2024

-2-

driving the car in which co-accused Satinder Kumar was sitting and from whose conscious possession 528 tablets of Tramadol were allegedly effected. Learned counsel submits that in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose as there is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from ASI Kuldeep Singh, has not been able to dispute the stage of the trial and also that the alleged recovery was effected from the possession of co-accused Satinder Kumar. Learned State counsel has, on further instructions, also not disputed that the petitioner was driving the car on the fateful day and even after he was arrested no recovery of any contraband, much less pursuant to his disclosure statement was effected.

4. On a pointed query, learned State counsel has conceded that the petitioner has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case. In support, he has filed custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner has been in custody since 18.09.2022; only 06 prosecution witnesses stand examined out of the 17 cited, hence, the trial would take considerable time to conclude. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to

CRM-M-22622-2024

extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

14.05.2024

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No