

CRM-M-31990-2023

260

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31990-2023
Date of Decision: 23.07.2025

Harpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatin Kundu, A.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
11	28.01.2023	Division No.4, Patiala	22 of NDPS Act

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC, seeking regular bail.
2. Vide order dated 30.11.2023, the petitioner was granted interim bail and the said order is continuing till date.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the short affidavit filed by the State. On 28.01.2023, based on chance recovery, the Police seized 1000 intoxicant capsules from possession of petitioner and co-accused. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements of the NDPS Act, 1985, and CrPC, 1973.
4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions. The petitioner's counsel argued that the custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever and the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.
5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the



CRM-M-31990-2023

NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Special Judge or Sessions Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the short affidavit.

7. An analysis of the above would lead to the following outcome.

8. The quantity involved is 1000 intoxicant capsules of Tramadol Hydrochloride and total weight of capsules is 546 gm, which is prima facie commercial.

9. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case.

10. The petitioner was granted interim protection, and at that time also, the Court was aware of the quantity being commercial. During the interregnum, there is no allegation that he had intimidated the witnesses, hampered the investigation, or did not join the trial.

11. As per paragraph 10 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 28.01.2023. Per the custody certificate dated 22.07.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 10 months and 01 day. Given the interim bail viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

12. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing the same for the bail stage.

13. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

14. Given the above, there would be no justification to discontinue the interim protection, which is made absolute subject to the petitioner complying with the terms of the bail order and the following additional conditions.

15. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the detection squad, members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearm(s). [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be



CRM-M-31990-2023

construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

16. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense and also to block the menace of drug abuse. In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

17. **This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State shall file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall have the liberty to cancel this bail.**

18. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

19. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. Interim order dated 30.11.2023 is made absolute. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

23.07.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No