

221

2025.PHHC.024137



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-61160-2024
DECIDED ON: 19.02.2025

BALJIT SINGH ALIAS BEETA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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 of 2023 seeking release of the petitioner on bail in case FIR No. 57 dated 29.07.2023 U/s 21 of NDPS Act 1985 later on section 29 of NDPS Act was added at PS Kiratpur Sahib, Distt Rupnagar, Punjab.

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

“Copy of Ruga "To, SHO, PS Kiratpur Sahib, Sir, Today I, ASI along with ASI Balbir Singh no.572/R, ASI Joginder Singh 530/R Constable C. Gurjit Singh 913/R, C-II Parvinder Singh 380/R on a Govt. vehicle bearing no. PB-5AW-5132 whose driver was Constable Himmat Singh 40/R was reached near Bus Stand Bunga Sahib for patrolling and checking the bad elements on the instructions of Inspector Satnam Singh Incharge CIA

Staff, Rupnagar. It was about 3 PM that I, ASI received a secret information that in front of bus stand Bunga Sahib about 10 feet below one car colour red Fortuner bearing no. PB29AE-8391 is parked and on the driver seat, Sohan Lal @ Kala son of Malkiat Ram, r/o village Pandian PS Sadar Banga, District SBS Nagar and on the conductor seat Poonam wife of Gaurav alias Billa, resident of village Ghanauli, P.S. Rupnagar and two boys are sitting on the back side whose name are Veer Singh son of Balkar Singh r/o Atari, District Amritsar Rural and Baljit Singh @ Bitra son of Pal Singh, r/o village Cheecha, P.S. Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural and there are Heroine in huge quantity in this car. The same they are bringing from the border area and are sitting for giving to some customer, against whom many FIRs for supplying the Heroine have been registered against them. Sohan Lal @ Kala is a Proclaimed Offender and if the raid is conducted now they can be apprehended along with Car and Heroine in huge quantity can be recovered. The information is true and reliable. Thus, Sohan Lal @ Kala son of Malkiat Ram, r/o village Pandian PS Sadar Banga, District SBS Nagar and on the conductor seat Poonam wife of Gaurav alias Billa, resident of village Ghanauli, P.S. Rupnagar, Veer Singh son of Balkar Singh r/o Atari, District Amritsar Rural and Baljit Singh @ Bitra son of Pal Singh, r/o village Chicha, P.S. Garinda, District Amritsar Rural by keeping Heroine in their possession have committed an offence under section 61/85 of NDPS Act, therefore, ruqa is being sent through for registration of FIR against the aforesaid accused through C-II Parvinder Singh 380/R PS Kiratpur Sahib. FIR be registered and number be informed. Control room be informed through wireless. Circle DSP Shri Anandpur Sahib was requested to reach the spot by I/ASI from my

phon e no. 98723-12196 and requested him to reach the spot and MHC PS Kiratpur Sahib was asked to send one lady constable at the spot, I/ASI along with police party are busy at the spot for the waiting of DSP at 4 PM.”

3. **Contentions**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the prosecution story, 300 grams of heroin was recovered from the present petitioner. He further contends that the petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case as nothing has been recovered from him, however, the alleged contraband was recovered from the alleged car. He further contends that the petitioner is in custody since 29.07.2023 and he has no connection with the main accused Sohan Lal and the driver of the alleged car.

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 alleged contraband i.e. 1 kg of heroin is commercial in nature. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in another case.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the custody period i.e. 01 year, 06 months and 14 days for which the petitioner has suffered incarceration in addition to the fact that investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 05.12.2023, charges have been framed on 06.03.2024 and out of total 14 prosecution witnesses only 01 witness has been examined and 02 witnesses have been given up, 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.

As far as the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as “***Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab***” decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial of concession of bail.

5. **DECISION:**

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

19.02.2025

Poonam Negi

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No