



CRM-M-6875-2025 1

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

216

**CRM-M-6875-2025  
Decided on: 27.10.2025**

**SUKHVIR SINGH ALIAS GOLDY****.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

1. Petitioner-Sukhvir Singh @ Goldy aged 28 years has filed instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 seeking regular bail in case FIR No.205 dated 26.08.2023 under Sections 21-C, 61 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Jamalpur, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. On 26.08.2023, at about 7:00 PM, one Innova Car bearing registration No. PB11-BF-4877, was occupied by total three accused, namely: (i) Sukhvir Singh @ Goldy (being driver) (petitioner herein), (ii) Harjinder Singh @ Budhu (sitting on co-driver seat), and (iii) Gurpreet Singh Goppi (sitting at the back seat of the said car). On searching the vehicle, from the dashboard of the car, 530 grams of heroin and currency notes, i.e., Rs.24,700/- of drug money were recovered.



3. Counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner has no concern with the Innova car and has been falsely involved in the present case. Petitioner is inside jail since the period of last more a period of two years and two months and trial is running at very low pace, Out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined and 01 another witness has been partly recorded. Thus, argues that petitioner cannot be detained in custody for indefinite period, untill, the charges are proved by deciding the fate of trial. Therefore, he prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer of bail and argues that quantity recovered is commercial in nature, and the Innova car in question also belongs to the petitioner, because, its ownership is in the name of none else, but his father 'Balraj Singh'.

Further explaining the status of trial, learned State counsel refers the report dated 25.08 2025 forwarded to this Court by learned Trial Court to this Court, wherein, it is mentioned that beside completely examining two of the witnesses and one as partly, four of the witnesses have already been given up by the prosecution. It has also been categorically recorded by trial Court that the statements of remaining prosecution witnesses and culmination of trial would be done within a period of six months tentatively.

5. In view of the report forwarded by learned trial Court, this Court does not deem it appropriate to consider the prayer at this stage especially



CRM-M-6875-2025 3

noticing that the vehicle in question (Innova Car) belonged to the father of the petitioner.

6. Faced with the situation, counsel for the petitioner does not press the instant petition at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as not pressed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

27.10.2025  
*Sonia Puri*

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