



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

222

CRM-M-53993 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of decision : 06.05.2025

Bimaljit Singh @Bimal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Raghav Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C., 1973 in case bearing FIR No.616 dated 15.09.2023 under Sections 15 (27-A, 29, 61, 85 added later on) of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Shahbad, District Kurukshetra.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith co-accused namely Jaspal Singh, the driver and owner of truck were found in possession of total 65 kgs of poppy straw contained in three separate plastic bags kept in the said truck. The present petitioner i.e. Bimaljeet Singh @ Bimal was cleaner of the truck in question and was accompanying Jaspal Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he was not in conscious possession of the contraband. He further contends that the petitioner is behind bars since 15.09.2023 and has undergone 01 year, 07 months and 21 days of incarceration. He further contends that out of 21 prosecution witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 01 prosecution witness has been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing custody certificate dated 05.05.2025.



However, he does not refute the fact that out of 21 prosecution witnesses, only 01 prosecution witness has been examined so far.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 01 year, 07 months and 21 days and only 01 witness out of total 21 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and therefore, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take long time and as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. In the present case, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. The pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

9. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

06th May, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No