



235

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

**CRM-M No.27139 of 2025
Date of Decision: 28.08.2025**

Partap Singh**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.183, dated 29.12.2020, under Sections 22, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Longowal, District Sangrur, Punjab.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the police party, while on patrolling on 29.12.2020, received a secret information to the effect that Jagga Singh @ Nat son of Seeta Singh was involved in selling the intoxicant tablets. It was informed that he would come on motorcycle bearing registration No.PB-04-T-3814 to sell large quantity of intoxicant tablets in village and if the barricading is laid at the Drain Flyover Link road, Lohakhera Road, Longowal, he could be arrested along with the intoxicant tablets. It was informed that Partap Singh (petitioner) son of not



known, supplies these intoxicant tablets to Jagga Singh @ Nat. On receiving the secret information, the police laid the barricading at the place disclosed and a motorcycle was seen coming, however the same was stopped. On asking, he disclosed his name to be Jagga Singh @ Nat. He was suspected to be carrying some contraband and thus, his search was conducted. On conducting the search, 1000 intoxicant tablets were recovered from him. He failed to produce any licence regarding the conscious possession of the same, thus the FIR was registered and he was arrested on the spot. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. The petitioner was named in the FIR as the supplier of the contraband. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 27.12.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur praying for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 21.04.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He has submitted that admittedly the petitioner was already behind bars in FIR No.79, dated 12.07.2010. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the custody certificate filed by the learned State counsel where his custody in this FIR was shown from 22.03.2013 to 05.04.2023. He has submitted that in a premeditated manner, the petitioner has been implicated in the present case, when he was already in custody. He has



submitted that on the very same day, the petitioner has been implicated in the present FIR as well as another case bearing FIR No.184, dated 29.12.2020 of the even date, i.e. 29.12.2020 in the same police station. He has submitted that false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars in the present case for last more than 07 months, however the trial has not been concluded. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who has been convicted in other cases as well. She has submitted that complicity of the petitioner was established during the investigation. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far. She has produced on record 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 petitioner on the date of occurrence was already behind bars in FIR No.79, dated 12.07.2010. Even otherwise, the co-accused has already been granted bail, from whom the recovery of contraband has been effected. Out of 19 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 07 months and 30 days as on 27.08.2025. Custody certificate further shows that the petitioner is involved in 07 other cases, however in 01 case, he is on bail, in 01 he has



been acquitted; in 02 of the cases he has already undergone the sentence and in 02 of the cases, he is not on bail.

7. 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. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time.

8. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. 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.

28.08.2025

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE