



113+225

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-12631-2025 in/and
CRM-M-3910-2025
Date of Decision:04.08.2025**

Mohd. Yameen

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.ShekhawatPresent : Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**CRM-12631-2025**

1. Application is allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Annexures P-22 and P-23 are taken on record.

CRM-M-3910-2025

1. The petitioner has filed the second petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant of regular bail to him in case FIR No. 109, dated 30.07.2023, registered under Section 22/29/61/85 of the NDPS Act and under Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, at Police Station City-1, Malerkotla, District Malerkotla.

2. According to the prosecution story, the petitioner was found in conscious possession of 1000 tablets of Tramadol weighing 287 grams, without any permit or licence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The quantity of

contraband recovered from the petitioner is marginally above the 'commercial quantity' and no independent witness was joined by the police party. He further contends that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. He is in custody since 29.07.2023. Trial is likely to take long time and no useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. He further submits that similarly placed co-accused, namely, Mohammad Zahid @ Aasif and Yaseen @ Bhalwan have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court on 15.07.2025 and 28.07.2025. Thus, it is prayed that he may be released on regular bail. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgments in **(i) CRM-M-37684-2021, Balwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab, decided on 14.02.2022; (ii) CRM-M-8212-2022, Tajinder Singh vs. State of Punjab, decided on 03.03.2022 and (iii) CRM-M-35186-2016, Manjit Kaur @ Jeeto vs. State of Punjab, decided on 01.12.2016.**

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, he fairly conceded the fact that petitioner is not involved in any other case.

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

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, custody period of the petitioner and also the fact that the quantity of alleged contraband is marginally above the 'commercial quantity', but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

7. 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.

04.08.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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