

2025:PHHC:107274



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31683-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 13.08.2025

Pronounced on : 20.08.2025

Harjinder Singh @ Honey

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Tushar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant one is the second petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 155 dated 31.05.2023, registered under Sections 18, 21(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station STF Mohali, District SAS Nagar. The first petition, bearing number **CRM-M-34684-2025**, was dismissed by this Court on 07.11.2024.

2. As per the allegations, the petitioner was apprehended by the police party on 31.05.2023 and recovery of total 260 grams of heroin was effected from him. Further, 500 grams of opium was also recovered from the dashboard of the car in which he was travelling along with co-accused Nanny. The petitioner is in custody since 31.05.2023 and is facing trial.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further argued that a perusal of the

2025:PHHC:107274



copies of the zimni orders passed by the learned trial Court, which have been placed on record, would show that the trial is substantially delayed as only 05 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far out of total 20 witnesses. Despite the fact that *challan* was presented on 17.11.2023, the trial is not progressing at proper pace. All this goes to show that conclusion of trial would take considerable long time. The petitioner is in custody since 31.05.2023. He is not involved in any other case of similar nature. In view of substantial delay in trial, the petitioner is entitled to get benefit of bail. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have been apprehended by the police party on 31.05.2023 while he was travelling along with co-accused Narinder Singh @ Nanny in a car bearing registration number HR-51-AC-3517. Recovery of 260 grams of heroin was effected from the petitioner, whereas 255 grams of heroin was recovered from co-accused Narinder Singh @ Nanny. Investigation has since been completed and *challan* has been presented on 23.11.2023. However, a perusal of the record reveals that out of total 20 prosecution witnesses, only 05 witnesses have been examined so far. The trial is obviously delayed and there is no likelihood of the same to conclude in near future. The

2025:PHHC:107274



petitioner is in long incarceration. Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rabi Prakash vs. State of Odisha : 2023 Live Law (SC) 533*** has held that the prolonged incarceration, generally militates against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and in such a situation, the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37(1)(b)(ii) of the NDPS Act. Similar view has been taken by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ankur Chaudhary vs. State of Madhya Pradesh : 2024 (4) RCR (Criminal) 172***. Reliance can also be placed upon ***Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain vs. State (NCT of Delhi) : 2023 AIR(SC) 1648 2023 AIR(SC) 1648***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court, while granting concession of regular bail to an accused, from whom commercial quantity of the contraband was allegedly recovered, has held that grant of bail on the ground of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Reference can also be made to the authority cited as ***Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another, 2022(10) SCC 51***, wherein similar observations were made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Reliance can also be placed upon the authority cited as ***Bhupender Singh vs. Narcotic Control Bureau : (2022) 2 RCR (Criminal) 706***, wherein a Division Bench of this Court, after considering issue with respect to achieving balance between right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors enumerated under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, has held that convict/accused is not precluded from claiming bail invoking parameters of Article 21 of the Constitution of India *de-hors* the stringent provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. In the present case, apparently and evidently, the trial is substantially delayed. Therefore, keeping in view the aforementioned facts and circumstances and also the ratio of law as

2025:PHHC:107274



laid down in the aforecited authorities, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

20.08.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No