

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

**CRM-M-29466-2022**

**Date of decision : 15.11.2022**

Naib Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present : Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent-State.

**PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)**

This petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 582 dated 30<sup>th</sup> of November, 2019 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 15(c) and 27(a) of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad.

2. As per the allegations levelled in FIR on 30<sup>th</sup> of November, 2019, the petitioner was apprehended in conscious possession of 500 kilograms of poppy husk without any licence. Reply by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Tohana, District Fatehabad has been filed on behalf of the State, which is taken on record and the said fact that the petitioner being behind the bars since 30<sup>th</sup> of November, 2019 is not in dispute. As per prosecution, Challan was presented on 30<sup>th</sup> of May, 2020 and the charges were framed on 28<sup>th</sup> of April, 2021. Since then the trial has

not proceeded *qua* the petitioner. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner thus submits that the Challan having been presented and there being no other case under the provisions of NDPS Act against the petitioner. There are 18 cited witnesses and none of them has been examined as yet. He thus submits that the petitioner has undergone custody of approximately 3 years and has a right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. He submits that the false case has been foisted upon the petitioner who has no criminal antecedents. Counsel asserts that right of an accused to have speedy trial stands recognized under the provisions of the NDPS Act as well and, thus, Section 37 of the NDPS Act in such situation has to be read as subservient to the Fundamental Right of the petitioner guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

3. He further relies upon order passed by this Court in **CRM-M No.18805 of 2022** titled as **Satnam Singh vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 2<sup>nd</sup> of September, 2022, whereby the petitioner, who was in custody for more than 2 years, 2 months and 29 days was held entitled to bail. He refers to various orders passed by the Supreme Court in **Shariful Islam @ Sarif vs. The State of West Bengal** passed in **Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.4173 of 2022** decided on 4<sup>th</sup> of August, 2022, **Gopal Krishna Patra @ Gopalrusma Vs. Union of India** passed in **Criminal Appeal No.1169 of 2022** decided on 5<sup>th</sup> of August, 2022, **Chitta Biswas @ Subhas vs. The State of West Bengal** passed in **Criminal Appeal No(s).245/2020**

decided on 7<sup>th</sup> of February, 2020 and **Mohammad Salman Hanif vs. The State of Gujrat, Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).5530/2022** decided on 22<sup>nd</sup> of August, 2022 wherein undertrials have been granted relief of regular bail on the basis of custody dehors Section 37 of the NDPS Act. He also relies upon judgment of the Supreme Court in **Sujit Tiwari vs. State of Gujarat and another, reported as (2020) 13 SCC 447** wherein Apex Court found that a person in custody for more than 2 years was entitled to bail.

4. Mr. Jain appearing for the State does not dispute the factual assertions made by counsel for the petitioner based on record however he submits that the trial could not proceed for the reason some of the co-accused (Dharambir) could not be arrested till date and further supplementary Challan was required to be filed *qua* co-accused Tony alias Richpal and the same was filed only on 20<sup>th</sup> of July, 2022.

5. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the case.

6. The petitioner has already suffered prolonged incarceration of about 3 years. There is no other case under the provisions of NDPS Act registered against the petitioner. There are 18 cited witnesses and, thus trial is expected to take a long time and is not going to conclude in near future.

7. In the case of **Shariful Islam @ Sarif' case (supra)**, Apex Court found that an under-trial having suffered incarceration over 1 year

and 6 months is entitled for grant of regular bail holding that :-

“2. Taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is reported to be in custody since 27-1-2021 and has suffered incarceration for over 1 year 6 months and there being no likelihood of completion of trial in the near future, which fact cannot be controverted by the learned counsel appearing for the State, we are inclined to grant him bail.

3. The petitioner is, therefore, directed to be released on bail, subject to such terms and conditions which the concerned Trial Court may deem fit and find appropriate to impose upon him.”

8. Similarly, the Supreme Court in **Gopal Krishna Patra @ Gopalrusma's case (supra)** ordered as under :-

“The appellant is in custody since 18.06.2020 in connection with crime registered as N.C.B. Crime No. 02/2020 in respect of offences punishable under Sections 8, 20, 27-AA, 28 read with 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 19851.

The application seeking relief of bail having been rejected, the instant appeal has been filed.

We have heard Mr. Ashok Kumar Panda, learned Senior Advocate in support of the appeal and Mr. Sanjay Jain, learned. Additional Solicitor General for the respondent.

Considering the facts and circumstances on record and the length of custody undergone by the appellant, in our view the case for bail is made out.”

9. The Supreme Court in **Chitta Biswas @ Subhas's case**

(supra) ordered as under :-

*“The instant matter arises out of application preferred by the appellant under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking bail in connection with Criminal Case No.146 of 2018 registered with Taherpur Police Station for offence punishable under Section 21-C of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.*

*According to the prosecution, the appellant was found to be in possession of narcotic substance i.e. 46 bottles of phensydryl cough syrup containing codeine mixture above commercial quantity.*

*The appellant was arrested on 21.07.2018 and continues to be in custody. It appears that out of 10 witnesses cited to be examined in support of the case of prosecution four witnesses have already been examined in the trial.*

*Without expressing any opinion on the merits or demerits of the rival submissions and considering the facts and circumstances on record, in our view, case for bail is made out.”*

10. The Supreme Court in another case titled as **Mohammad Salman Hanif's case (supra)** ordered as under :-

*“The petitioner seeks enlargement on regular bail in the case FIR being C.R.No.NDPS/11192015200884/2020 registered at Changodar Police Station, District Ahmedabad (Rural) for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c), 21(c) and 29 of the NDPS Act.*

*As per the allegations, 358 bottles of cough syrup containing codein of 'commercial quantity' was recovered*

*from the petitioner.*

*We have heard learned counsels for the parties and are of the considered opinion that the questions like whether the contraband recovered from the petitioner is of 'commercial quantity' or whether codein phosphate is a manufactured drug or a narcotic substance, need not be go into at this stage.*

*We are inclined to release the petitioner on bail only on the ground that he has spent about two years in custody and conclusion of trial will take some time.*

*Consequently, without expressing any views on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the custody period of the petitioner, this special leave petition is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing the bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Special Judge/ concerned Trial Court.”*

11. Division Bench of this Court in **Bhupender Singh vs. Narcotic Control Bureau, (2022) 2 RCR (Criminal) 706** after considering issue with respect to achieving balance between right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors enumerated under Section 37 of the Act held that convict/accused is not precluded from claiming bail invoking parameters of Article 21 of the Constitution of India dehors the stringent provisions of Section 37 of the Act.

12. Right to speedy trial is one of the objectives of NDPS Act and is rather one of the checks and balances provided under the Act. Section 36 NDPS Act recognizes the need for speedy trial. The provision contained in

Section 36 providing for constitution of Special Courts is a means to achieve the end objective of speedy trial. Section 36 well recognizes the need for speedy trial. It is only with an objective to synthesize the right to speedy trial and rigors of Section 37 that the Supreme Court in the afore-referred cases granted concession of regular bail to the under-trials solely on the basis of long incarceration that they have suffered owing to delay in trial.

13. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the present case, the instant petition deserves to be allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions :-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence oral or documentary during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the one alleged in the present case.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the police authorities and shall not change his cell-phone

number without permission of the trial Court.

(vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

14. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by the Trial Court, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

15. Ordered accordingly.

November 15, 2022

Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

सत्यमेव जयते

