



CRM-M-26473-2025

-1-

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

245

CRM-M-26473-2025

Date of decision : 20.05.2025

Gobind Rai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

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

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

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.413 dated 19.11.2019, under Section 328 IPC (Section 22/61/85 of the NDPS Act added later on vide DDR No.20 dated 04.08.2023), registered at Police Station Sadar Mansa, District Mansa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was registered on the statement of Balkar Singh, who had stated that he was informed by the Postmaster that there were sealed envelopes in the names of villagers which contained intoxicant substance. After examining the CCTV footage, one Sikandar Singh s/o Jagroop Singh was identified who had affixed the tickets over the envelopes and he had nominated the present petitioner. Learned counsel, however, submits that the FIR was registered against some unknown persons and the petitioner was not named in the FIR. The petitioner is 80 years of age and is in custody since 06.03.2024. He is not involved in any other case and prays for release on regular bail.

3. Notice of motion.



**CRM-M-26473-2025**

**-2-**

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. 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, 04 months and 04 days. Learned State counsel, upon instructions, submits that 05 out of 27 prosecution witnesses have been examined.

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

6. In view of the above submission of learned counsel(s) and the fact that the petitioner, who is 80 years of age, is in custody for 01 year, 04 months and 04 days; he is not involved in any other case and the trial is likely to take time as only 05 out of 27 prosecution witnesses have been examined, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems 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.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

**(H.S.GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**20.05.2025**  
A.Kaundal

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