



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

229

CRM-M-2394-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.03.2025

AMANDEEP SINGH

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Jivtesh Singh Negi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer has been made in the petition by the petitioner seeking benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.21 dated 17.03.2019, registered under Section 22 of the Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Sadar Rajpura, Patiala on the allegations that on 17.03.2019, 4000 Alprazolam Tablets I.P Alprawin-0.5 had been effected from him. The petitioner was arrested. Thereafter, he was extended benefit of bail vide order dated 02.11.2021.

2. It has come on record that the petitioner absented himself subsequently and his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. Proceedings under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. were initiated against him and he was declared proclaimed person vide order dated 25.10.2023. He was again arrested on 25.09.2024 and he is in custody since then.



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that his absence during the period from 29.11.2021 till 25.05.2024 was not intentional but was due to the reason that he had met with an accident and it took some time to recover from the injuries, thereafter, he had lost track of his case. It is submitted that he is in custody from last 08 months 07 days. He is ready to abide by terms and conditions to be imposed upon him, therefore, prayer has been made for allowing the present petition.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It has been argued that the petitioner is habitual offender as he is involved in some other cases. He has even been held guilty and convicted in case registered under Sections 457 & 380 of IPC and is undergoing sentence in the said case w.e.f. 03.01.2025. There are chances of his absconding again, if extended benefit of bail to him. It is, therefore, urged that petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner has remained in custody in this case for last 08 months 07 days. Now he has been sentenced to undergo imprisonment in another case and as per custody certificate, the period of custody in this case is not to be counted.

7. Keeping in view the observations as made in the petition and the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing

2025:PHHC:031268



personal as well as surety bonds to the extent of **two sureties** to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala. However, this petition shall be deemed to be dismissed if the petitioner does not abide by this order.

8. Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

05.03.2025
Deepak Patwal

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. | <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| 2. | <i>Whether reportable</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |