



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

CRM-M-14587-2024

Date of Decision:-10.01.2025

Deepak Kumar.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

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

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kumar Passi, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this third petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.275 dated 19.06.2022 under Sections 22(c)/25 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and later on added Section 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala, Punjab.

2. The brief facts of the case are that secret information was received that Navdeep Goyal @ Tony (since granted the concession of bail vide order dated 16.01.2024 in CRM-M-49963-2023) and Binder Singh, who were running chemist shops were in the trade of selling intoxicating tablets and capsules. They would be bringing the same in their vehicle make Creta bearing registration No. PB-197-0097. If a nakabandi is setup, they could be apprehended.

Based on the aforementioned information, the aforementioned accused came to be apprehended and were found to be in possession of 1,40,100 capsules of Prebasun-300 mg., 75 small boxes containing 15,000



loose capsules of Prebasun-300 mg. labeled as RIDLEY, 3200 intoxicant tablets labeled as Trakem-100 (Tramadol Hydrochloride Tables 100 mg) and Rs.1,30,000/-.

On 24.06.2022, at the instance of Binder Singh, 12 boxes of intoxicant tablets of AZOX-0.50 (Alprozolam Tablets IPO 50 mg) each box containing 20 strips, each strip containing 10 tablets total 2400 intoxicant tablets having batch No.AT22179 Mfg. 02/2022 Exp. 01/2025, 20 boxes of intoxicant tablets of E-0.25 (Etizolam Tablets 0.50 mg) each box containing 10 strips each strip containing 10 tablets, thus, total 2000 intoxicant tablets having batch No.AT22309 Mfg. 04/2022 Exp.03/2025 came to be recovered from his house.

During the investigation, Binder Singh disclosed that he used to supply the intoxicating tablets to one Deepak Kumar (petitioner) and on the basis of the said statement, the offence under Section 29 of the NDPS Act was added and Deepak Kumar was arrested on 30.06.2022. From his possession, 4350 capsules of which 2175 capsules contained salt Tramadol Hydrochloride came to be recovered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. The mandatory provisions of Sections 42 and 50 of the NDPS Act have not been complied with in their proper perspective. No independent witness was joined at the time of search and seizure. In one other case bearing FIR No.165 dated 20.07.2010 under Sections 22, 61, 85 of the NDPS Act, 1985, P.S. City-1 Mansa, he had already been convicted. As he was in custody since 30.06.2022 and only 05 out of the 26 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far, the trial of the present case was not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he was entitled to the concession of bail in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble



Supreme Court in the case of ***Nitish Adhikary @ Bapan Versus The State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) Nos.5769/2022 arising out of judgment and order dated 04.05.2022 in CRM(NDPS) No.442/2022, decided on 01.08.2022 and Hasanujjaman & others Versus The State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.(s).3221/2023 arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 29.11.2022 in CRM(NDPS) No.1323/2022, decided on 04.05.2023.***

4. The learned State counsel on the other hand contends that the petitioner is a habitual offender with one other case bearing FIR No.165 dated 20.07.2010 under Sections 22, 61, 85 of the NDPS Act, 1985, P.S. City-1 Mansa, wherein he had been convicted. Therefore, in view of the bar contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, the petitioner was not entitled to the grant of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner was in custody since 30.06.2022 and only 05 out of the 26 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far.

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

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Nitish Adhikary @ Bapan Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) Nos.5769/2022 Decided on 01.08.2022*** held as under:-

“As per the office report dated 29.07.2022, copy of the show cause notice along with Special Leave Petition was supplied to the Standing Counsel for the State of West Bengal and separate notice has been served on the State also. However, no one has entered appearance on their behalf.

The petitioner seeks enlargement on bail in F.I.R. No. 612 of 2020 dated 17.10.2020 filed under Section 21(c) and 37 of the NDPS 2 Act, registered at Police Station Bongaon, West Bengal.

During the course of the hearing, we are informed that the petitioner has undergone custody for a period of



01 year and 07 months as on 09.06.2022. The trial is at a preliminary stage, as only one witness has been examined. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents.

Taking into consideration the period of sentence undergone by the petitioner and all the attending circumstances but without expressing any views in the merits of the case, we are inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

The petitioner is accordingly, directed to be released on bail subject to him furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

The Special Leave Petition is disposed of on the aforestated terms.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

7. In ***Hasanujjaman & others Versus The State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.(s).3221/2023, decided on 04.05.2023,*** held as under:-

“1. There are three petitioners in this Special Leave Petition, who were accused of committing an offence under Sections 21(c)/29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, ‘NDPS Act’) in FIR No.18/2022, dated 09.01.2022, registered at Police Station Islampur, District Murshidabad, West Bengal.

*2. The allegations are that when the police party intercepted the petitioners along with another person riding on two motorcycles, they were found in possession of codeine phosphate in a consignment of phensedyl bottles loaded in two nylon bags. During the search, 115 bottles (100 ml. each) of phensedyl were recovered from the joint possession of the petitioners. ***They were arrested on the spot and have been in custody for more than one year and four months.****

3. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the record.

*4. ***The investigation is complete; chargesheet has been filed, though the charges are yet to be framed. The****



conclusion of trial will, thus, take some reasonable time, regardless of the direction issued by the High Court to conclude the same within one year from the date of framing of charges. The petitioners do not have any criminal antecedents. There is, thus, substantial compliance of Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

5. In such circumstances, but without expressing any views on the merits of the case, we deem it appropriate to release the petitioners on bail subject to the terms and conditions as may be imposed by the Trial Court.

6. Additionally, it is clarified that in case the petitioners are found involved in any other case under the NDPS Act or other penal law, it shall amount to misuse of the concession of bail granted to them today, and in such a case, necessary consequences shall follow.

7. The petitioners are further directed to appear before the Trial Court regularly. In the event of they being absent, it shall again be taken as a misuse of concession of bail.

8. The Special Leave Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

9. As a result, pending interlocutory application also stands disposed of.

(emphasis supplied)

8. Admittedly, in '**Nitish Adhikary @ Bapan (supra) and Hasanujjaman & others (supra)**', the accused therein had been granted the concession of bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court after they had undergone approximately one and a half years of custody. They were also first-time offenders as is borne out from the orders.

9. In the instant case, the petitioner is stated to be in custody since 30.06.2022 and only 05 of the 26 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. In the other case registered against him under the NDPS Act he had been convicted. In this situation, the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be diluted to an extent in view of the salutary provisions of Article 21 of



the Constitution of India which provides for the right to a speedy trial and the case of the petitioner can be considered for the grant of bail.

10. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Deepak Kumar** son of Sh. Ravi Chand is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

11. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the cases mentioned in this order.

12. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

13. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

January 10, 2025
Vinay

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