



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

CRM-M-4145-2025

Date of Decision:03.04.2025

Charanjit Singh @ Goldy

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Ms. Taranjit Kaur Hundal, Advocate with
Mr. Harnaaz Kaur Hundal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No. 136, dated 23.07.2020, registered under Section 15 and 29 of NDPS Act, Police Station Garshankar, District Hoshiarpur, Punjab (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case the allegations were primarily levelled against Vijay Kumar, co-accused, who was apprehended at the spot by the police, while he was carrying 360 Kgs of poppy husk in his conscious possession, without any permit or license. The petitioner was arrayed as an accused in the present case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by Vijay Kumar, co-accused and there is no other evidence against him. During the course of investigation, the police allegedly recovered the driving license of the petitioner from the truck in question to connect him with the crime, however, it does not advance the case of the

prosecution in any manner. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 10.11.2024 and no recovery was effected from him. After completion of the investigation, the final report was presented against the petitioner. The Trial Court ordered framing of charge against the petitioner on 01.02.2025, however, no witness has been examined so far. Thus, the Trial Court may take quite a considerable time to conclude the trial in the present case.

3. A short reply by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur has been filed on behalf of respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner, however, he admits that there is no other case against the present petitioner.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner was not found at the place of recovery, where 360 Kgs of poppy husk was recovered from Vijay Kumar, co-accused. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 10.11.2024 and after his arrest, nothing was recovered from him. Now, charge has been framed against the petitioner on 01.02.2025 and the prosecution has not been able to examine even a single witness so far. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his

furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/
Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

03.04.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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