



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

225

CRM-M-35818-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.09.2026

Satinderjeet Singh @ Santi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Akash Manocha, Advocate
for the petitioner. (Through VC)

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant one is the second petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 34 dated 17.03.2025, registered under Sections 21, 21-C and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and Sections 10, 11 and 12 of the Air Craft Act, 1984 (deleted later on) at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran. His previous petition was dismissed as withdrawn.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 17.03.2025, the petitioner along with co-accused Yuvraj Singh @ Rajdeep, while coming on a motorcycle, was apprehended by a police party and recovery of 506 grams of heroin was effected from their conscious possession. They were formally arrested at the spot. On interrogation, they suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the subject crime. Some other persons were also named in this case as accused. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, *challan* was presented before



the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforesaid mentioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, the recovery of the alleged contraband, shown to have been effected from the petitioner and co-accused, was planted by the police officials. No independent witness was joined at the time of effecting alleged recovery from the petitioner. The petitioner has clean antecedents. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been presented. The trial is likely to take a long time. The petitioner is in custody since 17.03.2025. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner as well as the fact that commercial quantity of the contraband was recovered from his conscious possession, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail as rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted. Trial may be expedited. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions of learned counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner along with abovenamed co-accused is alleged to have been found in commercial quantity of heroin on 17.03.2025. The allegations, therefore, attract the provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act, which impose additional conditions for grant of bail. At this stage, this Court is not required to conduct a detailed examination of the evidence or record a

CNR No: PHHC011061062026
2026:PHHC:127644



finding on the merits of the case. The plea of the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated and that the recovery has been planted upon him is essentially a matter of defence. It is true that the investigation has been completed and challan has been presented and the petitioner has remained in custody since 17.03.2025. However, these factors by themselves cannot outweigh the statutory restrictions contained in Section 37 of the NDPS Act, particularly when the alleged recovery is of commercial quantity. No material has been brought on record at this stage to satisfy this Court that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioner is not guilty of the alleged offence. There is also no sufficient basis to conclude that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, his criminal antecedents, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be granted benefit of regular bail, at this stage. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.09.2026
Waseem R. Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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