

**CRM-M-59655-2024**

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****217****CRM-M-59655-2024
Date of Decision: 03.04.2025****CHHINDER SINGH ALIAS CHINDU****... PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL****Present:-** Mr. Priyanshu Kamra, Advocate for the petitioner.**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No. 402 dated 16.08.2022, under Sections 304, 328 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 21, 22, 29 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



CRM-M-59655-2024

-2-

overdose. However, during the investigation, no recovery has been effected from the petitioner. He further submits that he be released on bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is involved in one other case under NDPS Act. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 01 year, 01 months and 04 days. Learned State counsel further submits that the challan has been presented and charges have been framed.

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

6. 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 is in custody for the last more than one year and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

7. 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.



CRM-M-59655-2024

8. 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.

03.04.2025
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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