



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32737-2025
Reserved on: 01.10.2025
Pronounced on: 29.10.2025

Gurpreet Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. R.S. Sangha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, D.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
183	08.10.2024	Chheharta, District Amritsar	21-C of NDPS Act (Section 27-A, 29 of NDPS Act added later on)

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. Per paragraph 17 of the bail petition, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from para 5, 8, and 10 of the short reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“5. That the brief and relevant facts of the case are that the aforesaid FIR No.183 dated 08.10.2024 was registered at the Police station Chheharta, Amritsar City on the basis of a 'Ruqa' sent by Sub-Inspector Jagga Singh No. 2115/ASR, mentioning therein that on 08.10.2024, he along with the police party was present at India Gate Chheharta, Amritsar, where he received a secret information that the petitioner (Gurpreet Singh), co-accused Jota Singh and Harpreet Singh were involved in selling heroin at very large scale and they had come at Ghanupur Kale for purchasing the heroin and if the raid is conducted, heroin can be recovered at very large scale. The detailed facts mentioned in the aforesaid Ruqa has been reproduced in the true translation of the FIR attached with the petition as Annexure P-I, which may kindly be read as part and parcel of the present paragraph as same are not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.

8. *That the deponent humbly submits that during the investigation,*

heroin weighing 5 kilogram and 64 grams including the weight of packing material along with drug money of Rs. 4 Lakh 24 thousand was recovered at the instance of Harpreet Singh and Jota Singh from the almirah in the store of the aforesaid house no. 116, New City Ajnala, Amritsar, in the presence of Shivdarshan Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, West, Amritsar under the provisions of section 50 of NDPS Act, which was then taken into police possession vide recovery memo dated 08.10.2024.

10. That the deponent humbly submits that during the custodial interrogation, the co-accused Harpreet Singh suffered a disclosure statement before the investigating officer alleging therein that he came in contact with Pakistan based smuggler Ali about 6 months ago, who told him that he will get the packets of heroin dropped through drone and asked him (Harpreet Singh) to pick up the packet of heroin and supply it to the customers as per his (Ali) directions and he (Harpreet Singh) will get Rs. 1 Lakh per one kilogram of heroin. The accused Harpreet Singh further disclosed that he along with his cousin Jota Singh used to pick heroin from village Ballarwal after contacting with Pakistan based smuggler All and he also joined his younger brother Gurpreet Singh (petitioner), who also accompany them in picking and supplying the heroin. Harpreet Singh further disclosed that he had brought 5 kilograms of heroin from one unidentified person and one kilogram of heroin was given to them by the co-accused Dharminder Singh alias Rana, whose mobile number was +447440461038. On the basis of the aforesaid statement, the co-accused Dharminder Singh was nominated in the present case and Section 29 of NDPS Act was added vide G.D No. 27 dated 09.10.2024. The co-accused Jota Singh reiterated the similar facts as disclosed by the co-accused Harpreet Singh.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their 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 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 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 reply.

7. As per paragraph 8 of the short reply, the contraband is 5 kg and 64 grams of heroin.

8. Dealing in 5.065 kg of heroin in contravention of the NDPS Act, 1985, constitutes an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

Substance Name	Heroin/ Chitta/ Smack/ Brown Sugar/ Diacetylmorphine
Quantity detained	5.064 Kg
Punishable U/s	S.21(c) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Commercial
Drug Quantity in % to upper limit of Intermediate	2025.60%

Drug's Small & Commercial Qty. suggested by Committee report	
Notification No. & date	Expert Committee Report dated 24.03.1995 & 23.08.2001 (Small and Commercial)

<i>Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985</i>		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1055(E)	10/19/2001
Sr. No.	56	
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	Heroin	
Other non-proprietary name	*****	
Chemical Name	Diacetylmorphine	
Small Quantity	< 5 Gram (i.e. equivalent to 0.005 Kg)	
Commercial Quantity	> 250 Gram (i.e. equivalent to 0.25 Kg)	

0

Declared as punishable under NDPS Act and as per schedule defined in S.2(xi) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985		
Notification No. & dated	S.(xvi)(d) NDPS Act, 1985 (61 of 1985), S.O. 821 (E)	11/14/1985

Sr. No.	2(xvi)(d)
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	*****

Other non-proprietary name	*****
Chemical Name	2(xvi)(d) diacetylmorphine, that is, the alkaloid also known as dia-morphine or heroin and its salts; Explanation.-- For the purposes of clauses (v) (vi), (xv) and (xvi) the percentages in the case of liquid preparations shall be calculated on the basis that a preparation containing one per cent. of a substance means a preparation in which one gram of substance, if solid, or one mililitre of substance, if liquid, is contained in every one hundred mililitre of the preparation and so on in proportion for any greater or less percentage: Provided that the Central Government may, having regard to the developments in the field of methods of calculating percentages in liquid preparations prescribed, by rules, any other basis which it may deem appropriate for such calculation.

9. The total quantity allegedly involved in this case is commercial. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case. The petitioner must satisfy the twin conditions put in place by the Legislature under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

10. It shall be relevant to refer to paragraph 16 of the short reply, which read as follows:

“Evidence against the petitioner

16. That the deponent humbly submits that the evidence available against the petitioner is primarily based upon the secret information received by the Investigating Officer coupled with the disclosure Statements of the co-accused Harpreet Singh and Jota Singh, who had stated in their respective disclosure statements, disclosing therein that the petitioner was actively involved in selling and smuggling heroin with them. That it is worth mentioning here the calls details record of mobile number 8968685472 of the present petitioner Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, mobile phone number 9855425073 of the co-accused Jota Singh, mobile number 6239723713 of the co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Happy and mobile number 9855601210 of the co-accused Dharminder Singh @Rana have been obtained for the period of 01.06.2024 to 08.10.2024 and analyzed and it has been found that the present petitioner Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi has made seven calls to the mobile number of the co-accused Jota Singh and the co-accused Jota Singh has exchanged 446 calls with the co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Happy during the aforesaid period.”

11. The call details between the brothers cannot be suspicious unless the digital evidence of time and location is gathered. Based on the short reply and FIR, a perusal of the evidence points out that there is specific averment that the recovery was not from the petitioner's possession and the evidence is based on disclosure statement of the main accused.

12. For now, the petitioner has prima facie satisfied the first condition of section 37 of the NDPS Act to make a case for bail. Regarding the second rider of S. 37, this court will put very stringent conditions in this order to ensure that the petitioner does not repeat the offense.

13. In *Abida v. State of Haryana*, 2022:PHHC:058722, [Para 10], CRM-M-5077-2022, decided on 13-05-2022, this court observed as follows:

[10]. Thus, both the twin conditions need to be satisfied before a person accused of possessing a commercial quantity of drugs or psychotropic substance is to be released on bail. The first condition is to provide an opportunity to the Public Prosecutor, enabling to take a stand on the bail application. The second stipulation is that the Court must be satisfied that reasonable grounds exist for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence, and is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. If either of these two conditions is not met, the ban on granting bail operates. The expression "reasonable grounds" means something more than prima facie grounds. It contemplates substantial probable causes for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. Even on fulfilling one of the conditions, the reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such an offence, the Court still cannot give a finding on assurance that the accused is not likely to commit any such crime again. Thus, the grant of bail or denial of bail for possessing commercial quantity would vary from case to case, depending upon its facts.

[30]. From the summary of the law relating to rigors of S.37 of NDPS Act, while granting bail involving commercial quantities, the following fundamental principles emerge:

(a). In case of inconsistency, S. 37 of the NDPS Act prevails over S. 439 CrPC. [*Narcotics Control Bureau v Kishan Lal*, 1991 (1) SCC 705, Para 6].

(b). The limitations on granting of bail come in only when the question of granting bail arises on merits. [*Customs, New Delhi v. Ahmadaliev Nodira*, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].

(c). The provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act provide the legal norms which have to be applied in determining whether a case for grant of bail has been made out. [*UOI v. Prateek Shukla*, **2021:INSC:165 [Para 11]**, (2021) 5 SCC 430, Para 12].

(d). In case the Court proposes to grant bail, two conditions are to be mandatorily satisfied in addition to the standard requirements under the provisions of the CrPC or any other enactment. [*Union of India v. Niyazuddin SK & Anr*, **2017:INSC:686 [Para 7]**, (2018) 13 SCC 738, Para 7].

- (e). Apart from granting opportunity to the Public Prosecutor, the other twin conditions which really have relevance are the Court's satisfaction that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [N.R. Mon v. Md. Nasimuddin, (2008) 6 SCC 721, Para 9].
- (f). The satisfaction contemplated regarding the accused being not guilty has to be more than prima facie grounds, considering substantial probable causes for believing and justifying that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [Customs, New Delhi v. Ahmadalieva Nodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].
- (g). The reasonable belief contemplated in the provision requires existence of such facts and circumstances as are sufficient in themselves to justify satisfaction that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [State of Kerala v. Rajesh, **2020:INSC:88 [Para 21]**, AIR 2020 SC 721, Para 21].
- (h). Twin conditions of S. 37 are cumulative and not alternative. [Customs, New Delhi v. Ahmadalieva Nodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].
- (i). At the bail stage, it is neither necessary nor desirable to weigh the evidence meticulously to arrive at a positive finding as to whether or not the accused has committed an offence under the NDPS Act and further that he is not likely to commit an offence under the said Act while on bail. [Union of India v. Rattan Mallik @ Habul, (2009) 2 SCC 624, Para 14].
- (j). If the statements of the prosecution witnesses are believed, then they would not result in a conviction. [Babua v. State of Orissa, (2001) 2 SCC 566, Para 3].
- (k). Merely recording the submissions of the parties does not amount to an indication of a judicial mind or a judicious application of mind. [UOI v. Prateek Shukla, **2021:INSC:165 [Para 11]**, (2021) 5 SCC 430, Para 12].
- (l). Section 37 departs from the long-established principle of presumption of innocence in favour of an accused person until proved otherwise. [Union of India v. Sanjeev v. Deshpande, (2014) 13 SCC 1, Para 5].
- (m). While considering the application for bail concerning Section 37, the Court is not called upon to record a finding of not guilty. [Union of India v. Shiv Shanker Kesari, (2007) 7 SCC 798, Para 11].
- (n). The confessional statement recorded under Section 67 of the NDPS Act is inadmissible in the trial of an offence under the NDPS Act. [Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu, **2020:INSC:620**, (2021) 4 SCC 1]
- (o). In the absence of clarity on the quantitative analysis of the samples from the laboratory, the prosecution cannot be heard to state at this preliminary stage that the accused possessed a commercial quantity of psychotropic substances as contemplated under the NDPS Act. [Bharat Chaudhary v. Union of India **2021:INSC:877 [Para 11]**, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1235, Para 10].

(p). When there is evidence of conscious possession of commercial quantity of psychotropic substances, such accused is not entitled to bail given Section 37 of the Act as contemplated under the NDPS Act. [State by (NCB) Bengaluru v. Pallulabid Ahmad Arimutta, **2022:INSC:26 [Para 11]**, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 47, Para 12].

(p). Bail must be subject to stringent conditions. [Sujit Tiwari v. State of Gujarat, **2020:INSC:101 [Para 12]**, 2020 SCC Online SC 84, Para 12].

[31]. Satisfying the fetters of S. 37 of the NDPS Act is candling the infertile eggs. The stringent conditions of section 37 placed in the statute by the legislature do not create a bar for bail for specified categories, including the commercial quantity; however, it creates hurdles by placing a reverse burden on the accused, and once crossed, the rigors no more subsist, and the factors for bail become similar to the bail petitions under general penal statutes like IPC.

14. Given the above, the petitioner is entitled to bail and per custody certificate dated 30.09.2025, petitioner's custody in this FIR is 11 months and 15 days.

15. The petitioner's bail shall not be treated as a precedent for granting bail to the other co-accused with higher role.

16. The discussion is only for analyzing bail and shall not be referred to for charges and trial, which shall be on its own merits, without referring to this order.

17. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances unique and peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

18. Given the above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate or duty Magistrate, with or without sureties, with a maximum bond amount not to exceed INR 25,000.

19. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, the surety is capable of producing the accused. However, instead of surety, the petitioner may provide a fixed deposit of INR 25,000/-, with a clause that the interest shall not be accumulated in FD, either drawn from a State-owned bank or any bank listed on the National Stock Exchange and/or Bombay Stock Exchange, in favour of the "Chief Judicial Magistrate" of the concerned Sessions Division; or a fixed deposit made in the name of the petitioner, with similar terms and with endorsement from the banker stating that the FD shall not be encumbered or redeemed without the permission of the concerned trial Court, or until the surety bond has been discharged.

20. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

21. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

22. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

23. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the drug detection squad, their family members, as well as the members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report, discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be 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 from release from prison 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 in this case, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

24. 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."

25. In Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

26. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

27. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial, or violates S. 19, 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the Special Judge/ Sessions Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

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

29. It is clarified that this bail order shall not be considered as a blanket bail order in any other matter and is only limited to granting bail in the FIR mentioned above.

30. In Amit Rana v. State of Haryana, CRM-18469-2025 [in CRA-D-123-2020, decided on 05.08.2025], a Division Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court in paragraph 13, holds that "To ensure that every person in judicial custody who has been granted bail or whose sentence has been suspended gets back their liberty without any delay, it is appropriate that whenever the bail order or the orders of suspension of sentence are not immediately sent by the Registry, computer systems, or Public Prosecutor, then in such a situation, to facilitate the immediate restoration of the liberty granted by any Court, the downloaded copies of all such orders, subject to verification, must be accepted by the Court before whom the bail bonds are furnished."

31. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

29.10.2025

Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: YES.