



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

CRM-M-36236-2024(O&M)

Date of Decision:-10.01.2025

Dharminder Singh.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

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

Present:- Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this fourth petition under section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.71 dated 21.07.2020 under Sections 15, 18, 61, 85 of the NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Kheri Nodh Singh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. The brief facts of the case are that while the police party was on patrolling duty one canter was stopped coming from the side of village Fatehgarh Niwan being driven by a short hair person. On the conductor side one turbaned person was sitting. The said canter bearing No.PB-11-BF-4598 was stopped on suspicion. The driver disclosed his name as Dharminder Singh (petitioner) and the persons sitting on the conductor seat disclosed his name as Saadh Singh @ Ghoki (since granted the concession of bail vide order dated 10.01.2023 in CRM-M-49898-2022). Thereafter



another investigating officer came to the spot and after following due procedure, search of Dharminder Singh lead to the recovery of 1 Kg of Opium and the search of the petitioner yielded 500 grams of Opium. From the truck, 01 quintal 10 Kgs of poppy husk was 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.380 dated 02.07.2022 under Sections 08, 18 of the NDPS Act, 1985, P.S. Sihani Gate, he is on bail. As he was in custody for the last more than 02 years 07 months and 13 days and only 13 out of the 23 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.380 dated 02.07.2022 under Sections 08, 18 of the NDPS Act, 1985, P.S. Sihani Gate, in which he is on bail. 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 had undergone actual custody of 02 years 07 months and 13 days and only 13 out of the 23 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.

9. In the instant case, the petitioner has undergone actual custody of 02 years 07 months and 13 days and only 13 of the 23 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far. In the other case registered against him under the NDPS Act he has been granted bail. 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-Dharminder Singh son of Sh.



Shamsher Singh 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 cases mentioned in this order.

12. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.2,00,000/- 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