



231

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

CRM-M-13654-2025

Date of Decision:29.07.2025

SANDEEP SINGH ALIAS SEEPA

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, Deputy, A.G., Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the 4th petition under Section 483 of BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.19 dated 03.03.2023, registered under Sections 22 and 29 NDPS Act, 1985, Police Station Moonak, District Sangrur.

2. As per case of the prosecution, there had been a recovery of 2500 Tramadol tablets alongwith 15,600 intoxicant tablets from the present petitioner, which falls under the category of "commercial quantity".

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 03.03.2023 and is in custody for the last more than 02 years and



04 months. He further submits that the investigation is complete and the challan has already been presented before the trial Court. 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 State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious and specific allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail.

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

6. From the record, it is evident that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 03.03.2023 and is in custody for the last more than 02 years and 04 months. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

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

29.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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