



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-26798-2025  
Decided on : 25.07.2025

Harpreet Singh @ Billa . . . Petitioner(s)  
Versus  
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.  
\*\*\*\*\*

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

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 |
|------------------------|---------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------|
| Harpreet Singh @ Billa | 272     | 30.08.2023 | 22(c) of NDPS Act, 1985 (S. 29 of NDPS Act added later on) | STF Phase-IV Mohali (for whole Punjab) | Bathinda |

2. As per allegations, there is recovery of 160 strips of Tramadol Hydrochloride tablets USP 100 mg (Clovi 100 SR tablets), i.e., total 1600 tablets intoxicant tablets, from the possession of the petitioner. The average weight of each of the recovered tablet was 339 mg, which comes to 1600 x 339 = 542.400 grams in total. Maximum of the non-commercial quantity of the salt Tramadol is 250 grams.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is inside jail since 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2023, i.e., for a period of 01 year, 10 months and 22 days and



except present case, there is only one more case under the NDPS Act, wherein, non-commercial quantity was recovered from the petitioner, and in the said case, petitioner was released on bail on 23.09.2020.

Further submits that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far, therefore, culmination of trial shall take considerable time. Petitioner is the sole bread-earner, and he has to look after the family members including the minor children. Therefore, counsel for the petitioner prays for the grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, while appearing on advance notice, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 24.07.2025, in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. In response to the arguments addressed by the petitioner's counsel, learned State counsel submits that there is a substantial recovery in the present case, which falls under the 'commercial' category. Besides, petitioner is involved in one more case of similar nature. Thus, keeping in view the nature of offence and the antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve any leniency.

However, learned State counsel does not deny the factual position, as explained above and the status of trial, as only 03 prosecution witnesses has been examined out of the total cited 11 prosecution witnesses, till date.

6. In view of the foregoing facts and observations, this Court is of the considered opinion that the personal liberty of the petitioner cannot be



curtailed for indefinite period, as the trial is running a low pace, therefore, culmination of the same would likely to take considerable time.

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. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

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**

**July 25, 2025**

*J.Ram*

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