



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

CRM-M-10241-2025

Date of Decision: 22.05.2025

Randhir Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present : Ms. Divya Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner (through VC).

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S, for grant of regular bail to him in case FIR No. 281, dated 17.12.2023 registered under Section 21 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural (Annexure P-1).
2. According to the prosecution story, the petitioner was found in conscious possession of 290 grams of heroin, without any permit or licence.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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'. 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 17.12.2023. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose. 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 State counsel 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 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. Therefore, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

22.05.2025
hitesh

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