



238

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

**CRM-M No.22343 of 2025
Date of Decision: 13.11.2025**

Surinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate and
Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present third petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.137, dated 24.07.2023, under Section 21, 25 of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Sidhwan Bet, District Ludhiana Rural, Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the police party, while on patrolling on 24.07.2023, received a secret information to the effect that Surinder Singh (petitioner) and Naib Singh were involved in selling of heroin. It was informed that they were coming from Gagkalan to Sidhwan Bet for selling the heroin on their Apache Motorcycle bearing registration No.PB-08-DT-9155 and in case of barricading, they could be apprehended along with the contraband. On receiving the secret information, the



raiding party was constituted and the barricading was laid at the place as disclosed in the secret information. A motorcycle, as disclosed, was seen coming on which 2 persons were riding. However, on suspicion, they were apprehended and on asking, driver of the motorcycle disclosed his name to be Surinder Singh (petitioner) whereas the person riding pillion, disclosed his name to be Naib Singh and he was holding a carrot coloured bag. They were suspected to be carrying some contraband and thus, their search was conducted. On conducting the search of the bag being carried by Naib Singh, 3 Kgs of heroin was recovered. They failed to produce any licence regarding the conscious possession of the same and thus, the FIR was registered and both were arrested on the spot. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The samples taken were sent to the FSL and on receipt of FSL report, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 18.12.2023. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-65024-2023 and CRM-M-47625-2024, however the same were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 29.02.2024 and 27.09.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present third petition praying for the grant of bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has



submitted that the FIR has been registered on the basis of secret information but there is a violation of mandatory provisions of Section 42 of NDPS Act. He has submitted that there is a violation of mandatory provisions of Section 50 of NDPS Act as well in conducting the search. He has submitted that no independent witness has been joined. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 25.07.2023 and thus he has suffered incarceration of more than 02 years but till date, there is no progress in the trial and thus, his right of speedy trial has been miserably defeated. He has submitted that though the petitioner is involved in other cases, however majority of the cases have been registered while he was already in custody. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was specifically named in the secret information. He has submitted that on conducting the search, 03 Kgs of heroin was recovered, which is a commercial quantity and thus, the provisions of Section 37 of NDPS Act are attracted. He has submitted that the petitioner is facing prosecution in other cases as well. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR was registered on the basis of secret



information and the petitioner was arrested on the spot on 25.07.2023. The alleged recovery of 3 Kgs of heroin has been effected in the present case, which is commercial in nature. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 03 months and 13 days on the 12.11.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 06 other cases, however as submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner before this Court, majority of the cases have been registered while the petitioner is already in custody and in 02 of the cases, he is on bail. Out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court cannot ignore the fact that the speedy trial is the fundamental right of every accused.

7. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Mohd Muslim @ Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 LiveLaw(SC)260**, this Court is of the opinion that the case of the petitioner is covered by the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In the abovesaid case Hon'ble Supreme Court expressed its views as under:-

19. A plain and literal interpretation of the conditions under Section 37 (i.e., that Court should be satisfied that the accused is not guilty and would not commit any offence) would effectively exclude grant of bail altogether, resulting in punitive detention and unsanctioned preventive detention as well. Therefore, the only manner in which such special conditions as enacted under Section 37 can be considered within constitutional parameters is where the court is reasonably satisfied on a prima facie look at the material on record (whenever the bail application is made) that the accused is not guilty. Any other interpretation, would result in complete denial of the bail to a person accused of offences



such as those enacted under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

20. xxxxx

21.it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable.

22. xxxxx

23. There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, “as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal”²² (also see Donald Clemmer’s ‘The Prison Community’ published in 1940²³). Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials – especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up and concluded speedily.”

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the



satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

13.11.2025

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