

2025:PHHC:102395



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

CRM-M-25296-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 06.08.2025

Pronounced on : 08.08.2025

Manpreet Singh @ Babbu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Ms. Anu Bala Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 15 dated 06.03.2025, registered under Sections 18(b), 27 and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Sadar Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that on 05.03.2025, on the basis of secret information, co-accused Raju was apprehended by a police party headed by ASI Jagdish and recovery of 03 kgs. 500 grams of Opium along with drug money of Rs. 35,000/- was effected from him. Thereafter, at his instance, another recovery of 07 kgs. of Opium was effected from his house. Upon interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his guilt and disclosed that the present petitioner had purchased 200 grams of Opium from him. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was nominated in this case and was arrested on

2025:PHHC:102395



09.03.2025 and recovery of 170 grams of Opium was effected from him. Some other persons were also named in this case as accused. Investigation now stands completed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, a false recovery has been planted upon him. Mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with. The quantity of the contraband allegedly recovered from the petitioner otherwise does not fall under commercial quantity. Even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and *challan* is to be filed by the prosecution. Conclusion of trial would take considerable time. The petitioner is in custody since 09.03.2025. He has falsely been implicated in some other cases also but he is on bail in those cases. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Custody certificate of the petitioner as well as the status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner has been nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure made by co-accused Raju, from whose custody, recovery of total 10.5 kgs. of Opium was effected. The allegation against the petitioner is that

2025:PHHC:102395



he had purchased 200 grams of the said contraband from the co-accused, out of which, 170 grams of the contraband was shown to have been recovered from him. The said quantity of the contraband does not fall under commercial quantity. The investigation of the case is now complete and *challan* shall be filed in due course, which means that conclusion of trial would take considerable time. The petitioner is on bail in other cases. He is in custody since 09.03.2025. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

08.08.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No