



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

232

CRM-M-15027-2025  
Date of decision: 19.05.2025

Hoshiyar Singh @ Hoshyar Singh @ Ramlu ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, A.A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

| FIR No. | Dated      | Police Station    | Section            |
|---------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 219     | 08.04.2024 | Samalkha, Panipat | 22 (C) of NDPS Act |

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court second time under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.

2. As per paragraph 5 of the bail application and as per paragraph 4 (E) of the status report, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

| Sr. No. | FIR No. | Dated      | Offenses                                   | Police Station           |
|---------|---------|------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.      | 1028    | 2022       | 323, 34, 506 IPC                           | Samalkha                 |
| 2.      | 685     | 2012       | 323, 325, 341, 34 IPC                      | Samalkha                 |
| 3.      | 730     | 06.11.2018 | 148, 149, 186, 332, 341, 353, 427, 506 IPC | Samalkha, Distt. Panipat |

3. The facts and allegations are taken from the status report filed by the State. On 08.04.2024, based on secret information, the Police seized 11 Buprenorphine Injections IP 2 ML marked Leegestic from the petitioner's possession. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements of the NDPS Act, 1985, and BNSS, 2023.

4. The petitioner's counsel seeks bail on the grounds of prolonged pretrial custody.

5. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his family.



6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

**REASONING:**

7. As per para 4 (A) of reply, the weight and name of drug is 22 ml and it contains buprenorphine.

8. The quantity allegedly involved in this case is commercial. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case. The petitioner must satisfy the twin conditions set forth by the Legislature under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

9. In Sajan Abraham v State of Kerala, 2004 (4) SCC 441, the Hon'ble Supreme Court granted bail for possessing Buprenorphine because there was evidence which did not rule out that the Buprenorphine that was recovered was for personal consumption. However, this is not the petitioners stand, as such the said judgement does not apply on the facts

10. The petitioner is entitled to bail because the Hon'ble Supreme Court has granted bail on prolonged custody in the following judicial precedent:

11. Junaid Alam v. State of Uttarakhand, decided on 12 Aug 2024, SLP(Crl.) 7708-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

[2]. It is pointed out that the petitioner has been in custody for last more than 18 months since he was arrested on 25.01.2023. It is then submitted that only 3 out of the 10 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined and they have not said anything to connect the petitioner with the crime.

[3]. The learned counsel for the State would submit that the concerned Contraband are medicinal drugs but they are sold for profit. Moreover, it is of commercial quantity.

[4]. We have perused the nature of the Contraband i.e., the prohibited medicines (SYP Codectus 100 Bottles (100 Ml each), Cap Pyeevon Spas Plus 720 Cap Parvion Spas 800 Capsules, Spasonof NF 960 capsules, Capsules Spasmoproxyvon Plus 144, Proxywell Spas 2568 Capsules, Alprasafe Table 600 Tablets, Pyeevon Spas Plus 32 Capsules).

[5]. Having considered the above and the fact that the trial is unlikely to conclude on a near date, we are of the view that the petitioner – Junaid Alam deserves to be granted bail. It is ordered accordingly. Appropriate bail conditions be imposed by the trial court.

12. As per the custody certificate dated 17.05.2025, the petitioner's custody in this FIR is of 01 year, 01 month and 07 days.

13. The prolonged incarceration, generally militates against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and in such a situation,



the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37(1) (b)(ii) of the NDPS Act<sup>1</sup>.

14. Following the judicial precedent mentioned above, without commenting on the case's merits, and considering the petitioner's pre-trial custody, the weight of the drugs, coupled with the other factors peculiar to this case, further pre-trial incarceration is not justified at this stage.

**CONDITIONS:**

15. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaka Magistrate or duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

16. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

|    |                                                                                                                                      |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | AADHAR number                                                                                                                        |
| 2. | Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk. |
| 3. | Mobile number (If available)                                                                                                         |
| 4. | E-Mail id (If available)                                                                                                             |

17. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

18. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

19. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the members of society, detection squad and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons,

<sup>1</sup> Supreme Court of India, in Rabi Prakash v. The State of Odisha, SLP (Crl) 4169-2023, Para 4, decided on 13 July 2023



firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of release from prison and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

20. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense and also to block the menace of drug abuse. In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

21. In Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, the Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

22. **This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, then the State may apply for cancellation of this bail before the Trial Court, which shall be eligible, authorized, and shall have the discretion to cancel this bail.**

23. The concerned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is authorized to delete, modify, or relax any of the conditions mentioned above and is competent to do so in accordance with the law.

24. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

25. A certified copy of this order is not required for furnishing bonds. An Advocate for the Petitioner can download the order from the Court's official web page and attest it as a true copy. If needed, the attesting officer can verify its authenticity online and use the downloaded copy to attest bonds.



**CRM-M-15027-2025**

26. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)**  
**JUDGE**

**19.05.2025**  
Jyoti-II

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes |
| Whether reportable:        | No. |