

2025:PHHC:154800



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

CRM-M-31556-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 03.11.2025

Pronounced on : 11.11.2025

Arashdeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Ribhav Chadha, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 54 dated 27.03.2025, registered under Section 318(4) of BNS, 2023 and Section 22 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. As per the allegations, on 27.03.2025, on receipt of an information to the effect that a person was running a de-addiction centre in the area of village Buladhewala without having any valid permit or license and that there was a possibility of recovery of intoxicating substances from that centre, a raiding party was formed. The raiding party reached the informed place and found the accused Karaj Singh to be in-charge of that centre. Thirty eight patients were found to be admitted in that centre. During

2025:PHHC:154800



inspection, 30 tablets of brand Zelor-2 containing Lorazepam, 20 tablets of Zelor-1 containing Lorazepam and 980 loose tablets of different colours were recovered from the said centre, which were taken into custody. The persons admitted therein were shifted to a Government Rehabilitation Centre. The accused Karaj Singh was formally arrested. On interrogation, he disclosed that he used to take care of the de-addiction centre, which was owned by co-accused Mohit Bansal. He could not provide any license for the same. The accused Mohit Bansal was nominated as such. During the course of further investigation, Karaj Singh made another disclosure that the present petitioner was also running the de-addiction centre along with him and on the basis of the same, the present petitioner was nominated as an additional accused. He was arrested on 28.03.2025. He disclosed that he had remained in New Way Drug Counselling and had previously been admitted in the aforementioned rehabilitation centre for about three to four months as a patient. During his stay, he was associated with the centre and used to arrange intoxicating tablets and receive an amount of money in return from co-accused Mohit Bansal. As per the chemical examination report, the tablets contained Lorazepam. Investigation now stands concluded. The accused Mohit Bansal is yet to be arrested.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which cannot be considered admissible in evidence. He is in custody since 28.03.2025. No recovery has been effected from him and his complicity or involvement in the alleged offence has not been established.

The trial will take considerable time to conclude. Only the tablets containing

2025:PHHC:154800



Lorazepam fall within the ambit of NDPS Act and rest of the tablets were not found to be having any narcotic or psychotropic substance. The quantity of the tablets having Lorazepam falls under small quantity, being 6.03 grams only as the threshold for commercial for the said substance is 250 grams. The petitioner has clean antecedents and his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. In connivance with the co-accused, he ran a de-addiction centre without any valid license and kept intoxicating tablets in that centre in an illegal manner. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences if extended the benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the matter.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 28.03.2025. No recovery was effected from him. He was not named in the FIR and there is no document to show that the premises in question were taken by him on rent or that he was running the centre. Such questions are to be proved on a thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial. More so, the quantity of the recovered contraband falls under small quantity, being 6.03 grams only. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial would obviously take considerable time. Keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioner, his clean antecedents and the facts discussed above, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Accordingly,

2025:PHHC:154800



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.

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.

11.11.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No