



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

CRM-M-31685-2024

Date of Decision:-08.07.2024

Jaskaranjit Singh @ Karan.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur Grewal, Advocate for the Petitioner.


Ms. Ramta K Chaudhary, DAG Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (ORAL)

The Prayer in this petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of interim bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.85 dated 16.12.2023 under Section 21, 29/61/85 of the NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station City Banga, District Shaheed Bhagat Nagar till the receiving of the FSL report for a period of one month.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was arrested and recovery of 50 intoxicating tablets containing salt Etizolam and 2KGs of Heroin came to be effected from him.

3. The Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was in custody since 16.12.2023 and the challan already stood presented. The parents of the petitioner had disowned him and his wife after the registration



of the instant FIR and the relevant documents in that regard were attached as Annexure P-2 and P-3 to the petition. The wife of the petitioner was pregnant and on account of a complication she was to undergo a C-Section. As there was no one to look after his wife and his three years old son, the petitioner was entitled to the concession of interim bail for one month.

4. The Counsel for the State on the other hand contends that the petitioner had initially filed his regular bail petition which came to be dismissed as withdrawn as recently as on 29.05.2024. He was a serial offender with one other FIR under the NDPS Act bearing FIR No.117 dated 03.06.2023 under Section 21 of the NDPS Act. The medical condition of the wife of the petitioner was not such that the presence of the petitioner was required. In fact the documents showing that the petitioner and his wife had been disinherited appear to have been procured only for the purposes of grant of bail as pursuant to the first FIR registered against him on 3.6.2023, the petitioner and his wife had not been disinherited. Be that as it may, as a commercial quantity of contraband had been recovered from the petitioner and he was a serial offender, he was not entitled to the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. A perusal of the record would reveal that the petitioner had sought the concession of regular bail and the said petition came to be dismissed on 29.05.2024. The present petition has been filed with a view to obtain bail on account of medical grounds and for the said purpose, it appears that the documents have been procured to show that the petitioner and his wife had been disinherited. The petitioner is a serial offender with three other cases registered against him including the one under the NDPS

Act. Therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of interim bail.



7. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

July 08, 2024
Vinay

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