



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35175-2024 (O&M)  
DECIDED ON: 27.02.2025

GURBAKSHISH SINGH @ NIKKA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

CRM-8086-2025

This is an application for placing on record the judgment dated 29.01.2025 as Annexure P-5 and for exemption from filing certified copies thereof.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed subject to all just exceptions. Annexure P-5 is taken on record. Exemption sought for is granted.

Application stands disposed of.

CRM-M-35175-2024

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the Petitioner in case bearing FIR No.19 dated 22.03.2024 under Section 21/29 of NDPS Act (offence u/s 29

added later vide rapat No.12 dated 24.03.2024) registered at P.S. City Zira, District Ferozepur.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

*“P.S. City Zira, District Ferozepur. FIR No.18 dated 21.03.2024 u/s 379-C/336/323/34 of IPC, Sections 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act registered at City Zira against Gurbakhshish Singh alias Nikka s/o Gurpal Singh s/o Inder Singh, resident of Mohalla Jattan wala, Zira, P.S. City Zira, aged about 27 years. Disclosure statement U/s 27 of Evidence Act. In the presence of following witnesses, Gurbakhshish Singh alias Nikka i.e. accused in the said case during strict enquiry conducted by me, Si, made disclosure statement before me in addition to the incident occurred on 20.03.2024 in the said case by stating that "I am a drug addict. My family does not give me any other expenses. Due to which, I earn good profit by buying heroin from unknown persons for Rs.2000/- per gram and selling it to my customers for Rs.3500/4000. Yesterday also on 20.03.2024, an unknown person on a motorcycle without number gave me 270 grams of heroin near Saim drain bridge on Malle Ke Road at Zira. Some heroin out of which, I consumed myself. On the night after the incident on 20.03.2024, I stayed at the house of my friend Shamsher Singh alias Happy, resident Mansoor Deva. When my friend Shamsher Singh @ Happy went to arrange food-meals, I kept the remaining heroin in the ventilator of the room sneakily. Only I know about it, I can get the same recovered on my demarcation. Upon which, disclosure statement of accused Gurbakhshish Singh alias Nikka was recorded u/s 27 of Evidence Act. It was informed to accused Gurbakhshish Singh alias Nikka that the statement made by him is admissible in the Hon'ble Court. Signatures of accused Gurbakhshish Singh alias Nikka are being obtained on the disclosure statement and signatures of witnesses are also being obtained.”*

3. **Contentions**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was nominated as an accused on the basis of confessional statement which was got effected during the custody of the petitioner in another FIR bearing No.18, dated 21.03.2024 to the effect that he actually had purchased 270 grams of heroin from unknown persons out of which some has been consumed. The case of the prosecution reflect recovery of 260 grams of heroin from the house of the petitioner's friend Shamsheer Singh only and not from the present petitioner, however, still has been nominated as an accused in the present FIR under Sections 21, 29-61-85 of the NDPS Act.

**On behalf of the State**

On the other hand, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in Court, which is taken on record. He seeks dismissal of the instant petition on the ground that the alleged contraband is commercial in nature. He further submits that investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 16.09.2024, charges are yet to be framed and total 14 prosecution witnesses have been cited. The petitioner is also involved in two more cases meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the custody period i.e. 11 months and 02 days for which the petitioner has suffered incarceration; as far as the question of petitioner's involvement in two cases is concerned, he is on bail in one case and acquitted in another case i.e. FIR No.18 dated 21.03.2024 vide judgment dated 29.01.2025 (Annexure P-5); the recovery of alleged

contraband has not been effected from the possession of the petitioner but from his friend house, which raises doubt in the prosecution story itself.

In addition, investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 16.09.2024, charges are yet to be framed and total 14 prosecution witnesses have been cited, which is suffice for this Court to infer that the conclusion of trial will take long time for which the petitioner cannot be detained behind the bars for an indefinite period.

Reliance can be placed upon the judgment of the Apex Court rendered in “***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***”, 2018(2) ***R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein it has been held that the grant of bail is a general rule and putting persons in jail or in prison or in correction home is an exception. Relevant paras of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

*“2. A fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society.*

*3. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but*

*even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case.*

*4. While so introspecting, among the factors that need to be considered is whether the accused was arrested during investigations when that person perhaps has the best opportunity to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. If the investigating officer does not find it necessary to arrest an accused person during investigations, a strong case should be made out for placing that person in judicial custody after a charge sheet is filed. Similarly, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Surely, if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimised, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. It is also necessary for the judge to consider whether the accused is a first-time offender or has been accused of other offences and if so, the nature of such offences and his or her general conduct. The poverty or the deemed indigent status of an accused is also an extremely important factor and even Parliament has taken notice of it by incorporating an Explanation to section 436 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. An equally soft approach to incarceration has been taken by Parliament by inserting section 436A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.*

5. *To put it shortly, a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody. There are several reasons for this including maintaining the dignity of an accused person, howsoever poor that person might be, the requirements of Article 21 of the Constitution and the fact that there is enormous overcrowding in prisons, leading to social and other problems as noticed by this Court in In Re-Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, 2017(4) RCR (Criminal) 416; 2017(5) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 408 : (2017) 10 SCC 658*

6. *The historical background of the provision for bail has been elaborately and lucidly explained in a recent decision delivered in Nikesh Tara chand Shah v. Union of India, 2017 (13) SCALE 609 going back to the days of the Magna Carta. In that decision, reference was made to Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565 in which it is observed that it was held way back in Nagendra v. King-Emperor, AIR 1924 Calcutta 476 that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. Reference was also made to Emperor v. Hutchinson, AIR 1931 Allahabad 356 wherein it was observed that grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception. The provision for bail is therefore age-old and the liberal interpretation to the provision for bail is almost a century old, going back to colonial days.*

7. *However, we should not be understood to mean that bail should be granted in every case. The grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously and in a humane manner and compassionately. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be*

*incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.”*

Therefore, to elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to the accused as is the mandate of the Apex court in “**Hussainara Khatoon and ors (IV) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna**”, (1980) 1 SCC 98. Besides this, reference can be drawn upon that pre-conviction period of the under-trials should be as short as possible keeping in view the nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence, reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant.

As far as the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as “***Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab***” decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial of concession of bail.

5. DECISION:

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.02.2025

*Poonam Negi*

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned*  
*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*