

2025:PHHC:046941



227.

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

CRM-M-17412-2025

Date of decision: 04.04.2025

Jamna Singh @ Jamna

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Jimmy Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner
(through Video Conferencing).

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.121, dated 27.09.2023, under Sections 18, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Moonak, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 27.09.2023 and till date, the trial has not concluded. Hence, on this ground, the petitioner deserves the concession of bail, more so when he has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been further argued by the learned counsel that the car from which the alleged recovery of 5 kgs of opium was allegedly effected, was not registered in the name of the petitioner and although, consent memos and other relevant documents prepared at the spot by the police, bear the

signatures of the petitioner, however, they had been taken by the police on blank papers. Learned counsel, therefore, prays that in the circumstances, the petitioner deserved to be enlarged on bail.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, has argued that a specific secret information had been received qua the involvement of the petitioner in drug trafficking. On being intercepted by the police, the petitioner was apprehended driving the vehicle and after due compliance of all the mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act, a huge recovery of 5 kgs of opium along with Rs.50,000/- drug money was effected from the petitioner. Learned State counsel has further submitted that only 11 prosecution witnesses remain to be examined out of 19 cited; the next date fixed before the trial Court is 17.04.2025. Learned State counsel submits that the trial would not take much time to conclude in the aforementioned facts and circumstances.

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

5. The petitioner was nabbed at the spot pursuant to a specific secret information received qua his involvement in drug trafficking. The recovery allegedly effected from the petitioner is double of the minimum classified as 'commercial' under the NDPS Act. In addition, recovery of Rs.50,000/- drug money was also purportedly effected from the petitioner. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that the signatures of the petitioner were taken on blank papers by the police and thereafter, he

was falsely implicated in the present case, would be a matter of trial and cannot be delve into at this stage.

6. In the circumstances, the present petition stands dismissed.
7. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

April 04, 2025
sanjeev

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