



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CRM-M-27441-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.09.2025

Jasdev Singh @ Dev

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Jaiveer Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in FIR bearing No.17 dated 11.02.2023, registered under Section(s) 15(c), 25, 29 and 61 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Paramjit Singh @ Goga, from whose possession 90 kilograms of poppy husk was allegedly recovered. The only circumstance relied upon by the prosecution is that the truck in question, bearing registration No. PB-10DS-9935, stood registered in the name of the petitioner. It is further pointed out that the said co-accused, Paramjit Singh @ Goga, has already been extended the benefit of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 08.05.2024 passed in CRM-M-55245-2023 titled Paramjit Singh @ Goga v. State of Punjab.



3. It is submitted that the petitioner was already in custody on the date when the disclosure statement of the aforesaid co-accused came to be recorded in connection with FIR No. 199 dated 01.12.2022, registered under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Machiwara Sahib. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has undergone actual incarceration as an undertrial prisoner for a period exceeding one year, yet the charges have not been framed till date. It is also argued that there are as many as thirteen witnesses to be examined, and therefore, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid factual position. He, however, submits that the petitioner is involved in other cases as well.

5. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition with their able assistance.

6. A perusal of the custody certificate reveals that, in relation to FIR No. 80 dated 23.04.2017, registered under Sections 15 and 25 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Machiwara Sahib, the petitioner was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 40 days along with a fine of ₹8,000/-, and in default of payment thereof, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one month. The record further reflects that the aforesaid fine was duly deposited by the petitioner on 09.10.2018. It is also borne out from the record, and remains undisputed, that the petitioner was already in custody in connection with FIR No. 199 dated 01.12.2022, registered under Section 15



of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Machiwara Sahib, when he came to be nominated as an accused in the present FIR on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Paramjit Singh @ Goga. It is pertinent to note that the said co-accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 08.05.2024 passed in CRM-M-55245-2023.

7. Taking into consideration the circumstances noticed above i.e. the period of actual custody, the stage of the trial and that co-accused/Paramjit Singh @Goga has already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 08.05.2024 passed in CRM-M-55245-2023 and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

26.09.2025

Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No