



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

CRM-M-9461-2025

Date of Decision: 19.08.2025

Nishan Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the second petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant of regular bail to him in case FIR No. 108, dated 05.06.2023, registered under Section 21(c), 25 and 29 of NDPS Act and offence under Sections 420, 468 and 471 of IPC added later on, Police Station Chheharta, District Amritsar (Annexure P-1).

2. According to the prosecution story, the petitioner and his co-accused was found in conscious possession of 1 Kg 750 grams of heroin, 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 falls under the category of "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 05.06.2023. Trial is likely to take long time and no useful

purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. Thus, it is prayed that he may be released on regular bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of SLP No. 6690 of 2022, titled as **“Dheeraj Kumar Shukla Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh”**, in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:-

“2. The allegations are that on a secret information, the police authorities intercepted two vehicles on 23.06.2020 i.e. one 'Gray' coloured 'Honda City' car and the second 'White' coloured 'Swift Dzire' car. On an interrogation at the spot, Praveen Maurya @ Puneet Maurya, Rishab Kumar Maurya and Dheeraj Kumar Shukla were found to be occupants of the 'Honda City' car whereas the petitioner was driving the 'Swift Dzire' car. On taking a search, more than 92 kgs. Ganja was allegedly recovered from 'Honda City' car where as more than 65 kgs. Ganja was recovered from 'Swift Dzire' Car. The accused were arrested at the spot. The petitioner is, thus, in custody since 24.06.2020.

3. It appears that some of the occupants of the 'Honda City' Car including Praveen Maurya @ Puneet Maurya have since been released on regular bail. It is true that the quantity recovered from the petitioner is commercial in nature and the provisions of Section 37 of the Act may ordinarily be attracted. However, in the absence of criminal antecedents and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last two and a half years, we are satisfied that the conditions of Section 37 of the Act can be dispensed with at this stage, more so when the trial is yet to commence though the charges have been framed.

4. For the reasons stated above but without expressing any views on the merits of the case, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.”

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State has 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 recovered from the petitioner falls under the category of '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. Consequently, keeping in view the above stated facts and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Dheeraj Kumar Shukla's case (Supra)**, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.

(iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.

(iv) The petitioner shall surrender his passport, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case he is not holder of the same, he shall swear an affidavit to that effect.

(v) The petitioner shall also file his affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by him during the pendency of

the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, he shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.

(vi) In case, the petitioner is involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously.

(vii) The concerned Court may insist on two heavy local sureties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner.

8. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

19.08.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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