



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CRM-M-17186-2025
Decided on : 29.08.2025

GURMEET SINGH ALIAS DAUGHTER

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, Advocate,
to the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurmeet Singh @ Daughter	10	28.01.2025	21(c), 25, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act	Sarabha Nagar	Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that recovery in the present case pertains to 260 grams of heroin, allegedly found in the possession of the petitioner, Gurmeet Singh alias Daughter.

As per allegations of the prosecution, two individuals were present in an Innova car, bearing registration No. PB-05-M-0064, with



the petitioner seated in the driver's seat. The second person, namely, Karan Kalra, who was seated beside the driver, allegedly threw a polythene bag out of the vehicle. Upon weighing the contents of the bag, it was found to contain 260 grams of heroin.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the recovered quantity is only marginally above the threshold of non-commercial quantity, and therefore, it would be a matter for the trial Court to determine, as to whether the prescribed procedure for weighing the contraband was duly followed, or not. It is further submitted that, admittedly, the contraband appears to have been weighed by the investigating officer along with the polythene bag, which raises a question as to the accuracy of the actual quantity of heroin recovered.

Moreover, petitioner is stated to have been in custody for the last approximately seven months, and is not alleged to be involved in any other case of similar nature. It is further submitted that investigation in the present case stands concluded, and the trial is yet to commence. Considering the stage of the proceedings, it is likely that the trial will take a considerable amount of time to conclude. In these circumstances, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 28.08.2025, in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.



As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 06 months and 28 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against him.

5. Learned State counsel is unable to dispute other factual submissions as stated by counsel for the petitioner today before this Court. However, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

6. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record placed before it.

It is noticed that the petitioner is in custody for approximately seven months and is not implicated in any other case of a similar nature. Since, conclusion of trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

29.08.2025
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO