



220

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

CRM-M-23365-2024

DATE OF DECISION: 23.05.2024

SEEMA KAUR @ SEEMA RANI

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Mikhail Kad, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C., has been invoked for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 2, dated 04.01.2024, under Sections 21/22/29 (Act No.61) of The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 , registered at Police Station Barnala, District Barnala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that 11 vials of intoxicant syrup, labelled Vincirex, 110 intoxicant tablets brand ALPRASAFE-0.5 have allegedly been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and co-accused person Pardeep Singh. He further submits that petitioner is in custody for more than four months, investigation is complete and challan has been presented on 30.04.2024.

3. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to which, the petitioner is behind bars for the 4 months and 15 days. He has opposed



CRM-M-23365-2024

-2-

the prayer made in the present petition stating that the petitioner was involved in two more cases.

4. Be that as it may, this Court is of the considered view that since the petitioner has been in custody for 4 months and 15 days and and as per the principle of the criminal jurisprudence, no one should be considered as guilty till the guilt is proved beyond reasonable doubt, whereas in the instant case, trial is prolonged and likely to take long time and detaining the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period would amount to violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India and is against the principle “Bail is a rule, jail is an exception” as elucidated in the judgement of Apex Court in ***“Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another; (2018) 3 SCC 22”***.

5. As far as the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as ***“Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab”*** decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on



CRM-M-23365-2024

-3-

account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial of the concession of bail.

6. In view of the aforesaid discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Petition is disposed of.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

23.05.2024
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>