



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

222

CRM-M-25345 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 14.05.2025

Sube Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Sayyam Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in case bearing FIR No.737 dated 19.10.2023 under Sections 20, 61 and 85 (added later On) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Palla, Faridabad District Faridabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 10 kg of *ganja* has allegedly been recovered from the present petitioner while being apprehended alongwith 03 other co-accused namely Guddu @ Virender, Amar Singh and Shailender.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the quantity allegedly recovered from the petitioner falls in the non-commercial category. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested on 19.10.2023 and has undergone 01 year, 06 months and 25 days of incarceration as an undertrial. He further contends that out of 24 prosecution witnesses cited by the



prosecution, only 08 have been examined so far. He further contends that the other co-accused namely Guddu @ Virender, Amar Singh and Shailender have been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 06.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-17949-2025; dated 04.03.2025 passed in CRM-M-60246-2024 and dated 31.07.2024 passed in CRM-M-27050-2024, respectively by this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the State on instructions from ASI-Praveen, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing custody certificate dated 13.05.2025. However, he does not refute the fact that out of 24 prosecution witnesses, only 08 have been examined so far. He further states that the petitioner is involved in other cases under the NDPS Act.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the quantity involved in the present case falls in the category of non-commercial quantity and the petitioner is in custody for a period of 01 year, 06 months and 25 days and further, only 08 witnesses out of total 24 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time and as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. In the present case, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.



8. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

14th May, 2025
Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No