

CRM-M-14238-2025 (O&M)

223 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:038407



CRM-M-14238-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.03.2025

DHARAMPAL SINGH ALIAS DHARMU ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA ... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. B.S.Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. P.K.Aggarwal, DAG Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in FIR No. 402 dated 16.08.2022, under Sections 304, 328 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 21, 22, 29, 61, 85 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 added later on) registered at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been alleged that the petitioner has been named in the FIR along with 08 more co-accused. Learned counsel further submits that the nephew of the complainant namely Charanjit Singh was a drug addict and was supplied some drugs by the petitioner. The present FIR has been registered after the death of Charanjit Singh, who died of overdose. However, during the investigation, no recovery has been effected from the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case under NDPS Act and prays that he be released on bail.
3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the

CRM-M-14238-2025 (O&M)

petitioner, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 01 year and 21 days. Learned State counsel further submits that the challan has been presented on 25.04.2024 and only 02 witnesses out of 17 have been examined so far.

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

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsels, since the trial is yet to commence and the same is likely to take time, the fact that the petitioner has undergone actual custody for 01 year and 21 days and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

20.03.2025
Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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