



CRM-M-26569-2025

1

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

222

CRM-M-26569-2025
Decided on :19.11.2025

Amandeep Singh @ Amni

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. N.K. Manchanda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita* (BNSS) seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 48 dated 25.03.2025, under Sections 22,61 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Nangal.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, 12 injections labelled as Buprenorphine and 12 injections of Avil were recovered from petitioner's possession, from a black-coloured kit kept by the petitioner at the footstep of an Alto car bearing registration No. PB-30J-3852. According to the prosecution, recovery of Buprenorphine injections alone constitutes a violation under the provisions of the NDPS Act. No offence is alleged with respect to the possession of 12 injections of Avil.



CRM-M-26569-2025

2

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the medical prescription dated 20.03.2025 and submits that petitioner, being a patient, was prescribed the said injections, including “*Inj. Leegesic MD 15*,” alongwith other injections and tablets.

Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner is suffering from Extrophy of the Bladder with Epispadias since birth, a rare congenital defect in which the bladder is exposed outside the body due to incomplete closure of the abdominal wall. It is submitted that petitioner is a patient and is in custody since 25.03.2025 and is not involved in any other similar activities. Hence, counsel prays that plea for grant of bail be considered sympathetically.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while filing the custody certificate, confirms the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner and submits that petitioner has not been found involved in any other similar activity punishable under the NDPS Act.

Learned State counsel is unable to dispute the factual position explained by the counsel for the petitioner, including the petitioner’s health condition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto, including the custody certificate.

6. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations, petitioner’s medical condition, period of custody already undergone, and the fact that he is not involved in any other similar

**CRM-M-26569-2025****3**

offence under the NDPS Act, this Court finds merit in the prayer of the petitioner.

Consequently, present petition stands 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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, 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.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

19.11.2025*Rashmi*

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