
(2020) 12 P&H CK 0431

High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No: Criminal Revision No. 780 Of 2019

Rajpal Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Haryana

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 17, 2020

Acts Referred:

- Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 - Section 167(2)
- Narcotic Drugs And Psychotroic Substantes Act, 1985 - Section 22(c)

Hon'ble Judges: Suvir Sehgal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Aditya Sanghi, Rajiv Sidhu

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

Suvir Sehgal, J

This Court has been convened through video conferencing on account of outbreak of Coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic.

Instant petition has been filed impugning the order dated 18.03.2019 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa whereby application filed

by the accused-petitioner seeking default bail under Section 167 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure in FIR No.471 dated 24.11.2018 under Section

22 (C) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short "the NDPS Act"), registered at Police Station City Mandi

Dabwali, District Sirsa, has been dismissed.

Facts, in brief, are that an FIR was registered against the petitioner as he was allegedly found to be carrying 2620 strips of Tramadol Hydrochloride

tablets and 140 strips of Tramadol Parvon Spas Ridley tablets, which fall within the ambit of commercial quantity. The petitioner was arrested on

24.11.2018. Investigation was completed and challan was presented on 06.01.2019 but the FSL report was filed before the trial Court on 06.08.2019.

In the meantime, the petitioner filed an application under Section 167 (2) Cr.P.C. on 15.03.2019 seeking compulsive/default bail on the ground that the

challan without the FSL report was an incomplete challan and the petitioner is entitled to be enlarged on bail. This application has been dismissed by

the trial Court vide the impugned order.

Counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in M.Ravindran vs. The Intelligence Officer, Directorate of

Revenue Intelligence, Criminal Appeal No.699 of 2020, judgments of this Court passed by a Division Bench in CRR-4659 of 2015 titled as Ajit Singh

alias Jeeta and another versus State of Punjab decided on 30.11.2018; CRR-1125 of 2020 titled as Julfkar versus State of Haryana decided on

16.09.2020; CRR-1150 of 2020 titled as Rinku versus State of Haryana decided on 03.11.2020 and CRR-1135 of 2020 titled as Suresh versus State of

Haryana decided on 18.11.2020. He contends that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case and the trial is not progressing due to spread

of Coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic.

Opposing the petition, State counsel has relied upon the Full Bench judgment of this Court in the case of State of Haryana versus Mehal Singh and

others, 1978 PLR 480 and a Single Bench decision of this Court in CRM-M-44412 of 2019, Shankar versus State of Haryana, dated 20.12.2019, to

contend that without the FSL Report, the challan cannot be said to be incomplete. As per his instructions, only one out of 17 prosecution witnesses has

been examined.

I have heard the counsel for the parties and perused the paper book with their able assistance.

The entire plethora of case law on the subject has been considered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in Suresh's case (supra).

Vide judgment dated 18.11.2020, this Court has held as under:-

“9. In the given circumstances, this Court is also of the view that at this stage the Petitioner ought to be granted Bail in any case since he has

already remained in detention for more than 8½ months now and there is no record of his involvement in any other case under the NDPS Act, and

on account of on-going Covid-19 Pandemic, the trial which could not commence is likely to take a considerable time in its completion. Further, the

validity of the decision in disregarding the Division Bench's decision in Ajit Singh alias Jeeta's case (supra) cannot at this stage be said to be altogether

beyond controversy, since the matter has now been referred for consideration afresh in view of the decision in Julfkar's case (supra) which has

subsequently been followed in the case of Rinku vs. State of Haryana (supra).

10. Taking into account all the above circumstances, the Criminal Revision Petition is allowed at this stage and the Petitioner is permitted to be

conditionally released on bail to the satisfaction of the Ld. Trial Court concerned. It is however clarified that in case of any different result

coming forth from that in the decision in Ajit Singh alias Jeeta's case (supra), the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation/modification of this

order, if warranted at that stage.”

The judgment of the Full Bench of this Court in Mehal Singh's case (supra) has been distinguished by the Division Bench in Ajit Singh @

Jeeta's case (supra). It has been observed by the Division Bench that the

Court has interpreted the scope of Code of Criminal Procedure in the backdrop of general offences confined to the Indian Penal Code and other

statutes, but the Courts were not seized of a matter relating to a special Act, such as NDPS Act.

Following the dictum of this Court in Suresh's case (supra) considering the fact that the petitioner, who has unblemished antecedents, is in custody

for the last more than two years, and that the trial is not progressing due to the spread of the contagion, the revision petition is disposed of. The

impugned order dated 18.03.2019 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa is set aside. The petitioner, Rajpal Singh, is ordered to be

released on bail on his furnishing heavy bail bonds/surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate

concerned. The petitioner shall furnish an undertaking to the effect that he will not indulge in sale, purchase or trade of prohibited substance.

Liberty is granted to the State to seek modification of this order or cancellation of bail, in case the outcome of the case in the reference in

Julfkar's case (supra) is different than the decision in Ajit Singh alias Jeeta's case (supra).

Disposed of.