



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

229

CRM-M-14689-205

Date of Decision: 21.07.2025

Gurdev Singh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.


Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 439 of CrP.C., seeking regular bail in case FIR No.30 dated 19.05.2024, under Sections 25 of Arms Act and 120-B of IPC (Section 27-A of NDPS Act was added later on), registered at Police Station State Special Operation Cell, Amrtisar, District Intelligence Wing (CID).

2. As per the allegations, 102 grams of heroin is shown to have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner, which, in fact, falls under the non-commercial quantity category. The petitioner has been in custody since 02.12.2024, and a prayer has been made for his release on regular bail.

3. From the custody certificate produced before the Court, it is observed that the petitioner was earlier found involved in FIR No. 62 dated 04.05.2019, registered under Sections 21/29/61/85 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Sarhali, District Tarn Taran. In that case, he was granted bail on 05.11.2019.



Subsequently, the petitioner was again found involved in FIR No. 10 dated 07.02.2024, registered under Sections 21-B, 25, 29, 61, and 85 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Valtoha. In the said case, he was also granted bail, vide order dated 11.04.2024.

It is further noticed that the present FIR was registered on 19.05.2024, i.e., after the petitioner had already been released on bail in both of the aforementioned cases. This recurring involvement in offences under the NDPS Act, despite being granted the concession of bail on previous occasions, reflects adversely on the petitioner’s conduct and criminal propensity.

4. Such repeated indulgence in similar offences is sufficient to indicate that the petitioner is not of a law-abiding character and, therefore, does not deserve the concession of bail in the present case. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 21, 2025
rashmi

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>