



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

232

CRM-M-21084-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 29.04.2025

AHEMAD KHAN ALIAS SONA ALIAS AHIMAD KHAN

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**1. Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 483 BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR no. 401 dated 29.08.2024 u/s 22, 25, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“Copy of Rukka, "SHO P.S. City Barnala, Today I ASI including HC Ajay Singh 103 Br Ct. Harmandeep Singh 425/Br PHG Nadhir Singh 47628, PHG Jagtar Singh



27072 were driving on Government Vehicle No. PB-19F-1217 whose driver is HC Rajeev Kumar 91/br including laptop printer and investigation kit were present near Prem Pradhan Market, Barnala for patrolling and checking suspicious men and vehicles. It would be around 10:15 AM that special informant and informed in isolation that Sanjeev Kumar alias Bittu resident of Near Bus Stand Rampura who runs PB-31 Cafe at Near Bus Stand Barnala, Ahmed Khan alias Sona son Yusuf Khan, Sahil Kumar son of Raju residents of near the bus stand, who owns a motorcycle are in the business of selling narcotic pills. If they are searched at the grain market in Barnala, they can be caught red-handed along with a large quantity of narcotic pills, the report is firm and reliable. Thus, Sanjeev Kumar alias Bittu, a resident of near bus stand Rampura, owner of PB-31 Cafe, near bus stand Barnala, Ahmed Khan alias Sona, Yusuf Khan, and Sahil Kumar, son of Raju, residents of near bus stand Rampura, are accused of selling narcotics pills in their possession, which fulfills the ingredients of 61/85 of the NDPS Act. So the ruka is being sent against Sanjeev Kumar alias Bittu, a resident of Near Bus Stand Rampura, Owner of PB-31 Cafe Near Bus Stand Barnala, Ahmed Khan alias Sona, Son of Yusuf Khan, and Sahil Kumar, Son of Raju, residents Near Bus Stand Rampura to type the said printout and file a case by hand through PHG Jagtar Singh 27072 to the Police Station. By filing a case, the number should be made aware of the case. Control Room Barnala should be notified of via wireless. A report regarding Section 42(2) of the ND&PS Act is being prepared and sent separately. Myself, the ASI, goes to the grain market in Barnala to search for the accused, along with the ASI. Today, near Prem Pradhan Market, Barnala, AT. 10:50 AM, SD/- Malkit Singh, ASI.”



3. Contentions

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that recovery of 2700 strips each containing 10/10 tablets total 27000 tablets make Tramowell-100 (Tramadol) were allegedly recovered from a bag. He further submits that other co-accused persons co-accused Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi, Gurpreet Singh @ Guri, Kulwinder Singh @ Peeri have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 20.12.2024, 25.03.2025, 01.04.2025 passed in CRM-M-63199-2024, CRM-M-1571-2025 and CRM-M-1599-2025 respectively. He has argued that the petitioner is not involved in any other FIR meaning thereby he is not a habitual offender, therefore, prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in Court, which is taken on record. He seeks dismissal of the instant petition on the ground that the quantity of recovered contraband is commercial in nature.

4. Analysis

Be that as it may, considering the custody period i.e. 07 months and 27 days for which the petitioner has suffered incarceration; nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and recovery of total 27000 intoxicant tablets was effected from a bag; co-accused persons have already been granted concession of bail; antecedents of the petitioner are clean, in addition to the fact that



investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 24.02.2025, charges are framed on 18.04.2025 and total 18 prosecution witnesses have been cited, which is suffice for this Court to infer that the conclusion of trial will take long time for which the petitioner cannot be detained behind the bars for an indefinite period.

Reliance can be placed upon the judgment of the Apex Court rendered in “***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***”, 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, wherein it has been held that the grant of bail is a general rule and putting persons in jail or in prison or in correction home is an exception. Relevant paras of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

“2. A fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society.



3. *There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case.*

4. *While so introspecting, among the factors that need to be considered is whether the accused was arrested during investigations when that person perhaps has the best opportunity to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. If the investigating officer does not find it necessary to arrest an accused person during investigations, a strong case should be made out for placing that person in judicial custody after a charge sheet is filed. Similarly, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Surely, if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimised, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. It is also necessary for the judge to consider whether the accused is a first-time offender or has been accused of other offences and if so, the nature of such offences and his or her general conduct. The poverty or the deemed indigent status of an accused is also an extremely important factor and even Parliament has taken notice of it by incorporating*



an Explanation to section 436 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. An equally soft approach to incarceration has been taken by Parliament by inserting section 436A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

5. To put it shortly, a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody. There are several reasons for this including maintaining the dignity of an accused person, howsoever poor that person might be, the requirements of Article 21 of the Constitution and the fact that there is enormous overcrowding in prisons, leading to social and other problems as noticed by this Court in In Re-Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, 2017(4) RCR (Criminal) 416: 2017(5) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 408 : (2017) 10 SCC 658

6. The historical background of the provision for bail has been elaborately and lucidly explained in a recent decision delivered in Nikesh Tara chand Shah v. Union of India, 2017 (13) SCALE 609 going back to the days of the Magna Carta. In that decision, reference was made to Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565 in which it is observed that it was held way back in Nagendra v. King-Emperor, AIR 1924 Calcutta 476 that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. Reference was also made to Emperor v. Hutchinson, AIR 1931 Allahabad 356 wherein it was observed that grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception. The provision for bail is therefore age-old and the liberal interpretation to the provision



for bail is almost a century old, going back to colonial days.

7. However, we should not be understood to mean that bail should be granted in every case. The grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously and in a humane manner and compassionately. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.”

Therefore, to elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to the accused as is the mandate of the Apex court in “**Hussainara Khatoon and ors (IV) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna**”, (1980) 1 SCC 98. Besides this, reference can be drawn upon that pre-conviction period of the under-trials should be as short as possible keeping in view the nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence, reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant.

5. **RELIEF:**

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on him

furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

29.04.2025
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>