



similarly placed co-accused namely Satnam Singh @ Sattu has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 13.12.2023 (Annexure P-3). He further contends that only 03 witnesses out of total 15 witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of SLP No. 6690 of 2022, titled as **"Dheeraj Kumar Shukla Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh"**, in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:-

"2. The allegations are that on a secret information, the police authorities intercepted two vehicles on 23.06.2020 i.e. one 'Gray' coloured 'Honda City' car and the second 'White' coloured 'Swift Dzire' car. On an interrogation at the spot, Praveen Maurya @ Puneet Maurya, Rishab Kumar Maurya and Dheeraj Kumar Shukla were found to be occupants of the 'Honda City' car whereas the petitioner was driving the 'Swift Dzire' car. On taking a search, more than 92 kgs. Ganja was allegedly recovered from 'Honda City' car where as more than 65 kgs. Ganja was recovered from 'Swift Dzire' Car. The accused were arrested at the spot. The petitioner is, thus, in custody since 24.06.2020.

3. It appears that some of the occupants of the 'Honda City' Car including Praveen Maurya @ Puneet Maurya have since been released on regular bail. It is true that the quantity recovered from the petitioner is commercial in nature and the provisions of Section 37 of the Act may ordinarily be attracted. However, in the absence of criminal antecedents and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last two and a half years, we are satisfied that the conditions of Section 37 of the Act can be dispensed with at this stage, more so when the trial is yet to commence though the charges have been framed.

4. For the reasons stated above but without expressing any views



on the merits of the case, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.”

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious and specific allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. From the record, it is evident that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 05.09.2022 and is in custody for the last about 02 years and 03 months. Apart from that, similarly placed co-accused Satnam Singh @ Sattu has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 13.12.2023 (Annexure P-3). Out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

04.12.2024
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No