



CRM-M-3620-2025

1

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

230

CRM-M-3620-2025
Decided on:05.08.2025

Jaipal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.21 dated 14.02.2023, under Sections 21(c), 25, 27-A, 29, 61 of NDPS Act and Section 25 of Arms Act (Section 25 of Arms Act was deleted later on), registered at Police Station City Patti, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the case of the prosecution, recovery in the instant case is 1 kg of heroin along with alleged drug money amounting to ₹27 lakhs.

In order to rebut the prosecution's version, learned counsel refers to an agreement to sell executed by the father of the petitioner, namely Major Singh. It is submitted that, as per the said agreement dated 28.07.2022, a portion of land was agreed to be sold for a consideration of ₹32,50,000/-, and an amount of ₹26,50,000/- was received at the time of execution of the agreement. Accordingly, it is argued that the alleged recovery of ₹27 lakhs cannot be linked in any manner with any narcotics transaction and is, in fact, the legitimate proceeds from a land deal.



Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner is in custody since the date of registration of the FIR, i.e., 14.02.2023. Out of a total of 16 prosecution witnesses, only two have been examined till date. It is, therefore, submitted that the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time, and in these circumstances, a prayer for grant of regular bail is made.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, acknowledging that he has been in custody for the last two years and six months.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that petitioner is in custody since 14.02.2023. It is also noticed that out of a total of 16 prosecution witnesses, only two have been examined till date. In view of the slow pace of the trial and considering that prolonged pre-trial incarceration would amount to curtailing the petitioner's liberty for an indefinite period, this Court is of the considered view that a case for the grant of regular bail is made out.

Consequently, the prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

5. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case.

**CRM-M-3620-2025****3**

Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

6. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

7. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 05, 2025
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**