

Baljit Singh Vs. State of Punjab

Baljit Singh Vs. State of Punjab

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1043758

Court : Punjab and Haryana

Decided On : Aug-30-2013

Appellant : Baljit Singh

Respondent : State of Punjab

Judgement :

CRM not M-26116 of 2013 (O&M) -1- IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH CRM not M-26116 of 2013 (O&M) Date of Decision:- 30.08.2013 Baljit SinghPetitioner Versus State of PunjabRespondent CORAM: HON'BLE Mr.JUSTICE MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR Present: Mr.Mandeep Kumar Dhot, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.R.P.S.Sidhu, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab for the respondent.

**** MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR , J.(oral) Petitioner-Baljit Singh son of Balbir Singh, has applied for anticipatory bail in a criminal case instituted against him, on a private complaint by Drug Inspector, in which, he was summoned to face the trial, in violation of the provisions of under Sections 18(c).18(A).27(b) (ii) and 28 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Rules, 1945, by the Magistrate, invoking the provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C.2.

Notice of the petition was issued to the State.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, going through the record with their valuable assistance and after considering the entire matter deeply, to my

mind, the present petition for anticipatory bail deserves to be accepted in this context.

Kumar Naresh 2013.09.03 14:27 I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document Chandigarh CRM not M-26116 of 2013 (O&M) -2- 4.

During the couRs.of preliminary hearing, the following order was passed by this Court on August 14, 2013:- Learned counsel, inter alia, contended that the trial Court has summoned the petitioner, to face the trial, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 18(c).18(A).27(b)(ii) and 28 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Rules, 1945, on the complaint filed by the Drugs Inspector.

The argument is that although the petitioner was never served but the trial Court has issued non-bailable warrants against him, without any legal basis.

Heard.

Notice of motion be issued to the respondent, returnable for 30.08.2013.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to appear/surrender before the next date of hearing and the trial Court would admit him on (provisional) bail on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to its satisfaction.

5. At the very outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record the copy of order dated 22.08.2013, which would reveal that the bail bonds and surety bonds furnished by the petitioner, in pursuance of the order of this Court, were accepted and attested by the trial Court.

6. In the light of aforesaid reasons, the instant petition for anticipatory bail is accepted and the interim (provisional) bail already granted to the petitioner, by virtue of order dated August 14, 2013, is hereby made absolute.

August 30, 2013 (MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR) naresh.k JUDGE Kumar Naresh 2013.09.03 14:27 I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document

Chandigarh

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com