



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-36326-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-5.8.2024

Gurdarshan Singh ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Laghuinder Singh Sekhon, Advocate and
Mr. Gagandeep Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Inderjeet Singh Ladher, DAG, Punjab.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
10	6.1.2020	City Sunam, District Sangrur	22 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 and Sections 192 and 207 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.
2. The FIR came to be lodged pursuant to receipt of secret information on 6.1.2020 to the effect that Ajay Kumar, Navneet Singh @ Baru and Chhindi indulge in sale of intoxicant tablets and that on the given day they were proceeding Moranwali towards Biggarwal Road while carrying huge quantity of contraband. Pursuant to receipt of said information, barricading was laid and the police was able to intercept a vehicle bearing registration No.HR-



22M-2218 and aforesaid three occupants namely Ajay Kumar, Navneet Singh @ Baru and Chhindi were apprehended and 20000 tablets of '*Tramadol*' were recovered from the said vehicle. It is further the case of prosecution that during the course of interrogation they disclosed that they had procured the said tablets from the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, the admissibility and veracity of which would be debatable. It has further been submitted that the petitioner, in any case, has been behind bars for a substantial period of about 2 years, 7 months and 10 days and since the trial is proceeding at snail's pace, he deserves the concession of bail.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that the petitioner stands involved in one more case under NDPS Act and another case under Excise Act. It has been informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 2 years, 7 months and 10 days and that as on date 3 PWs out of the cited 25 PWs have been examined.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Without commenting anything as regards merits of the case, but having regard to the custody of the petitioner i.e. about 2 years, 7 months and 10 days and that it is a case where the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of a disclosure statement and also the fact that conclusion of trial is likely to consume time inasmuch as only 3 PWs out of the cited 25 PWs have been examined far, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.



CRM-M-36326-2024 (O&M) (3)

7. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

5.8.2024
Pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No