

CRM-M-33594-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33594-2025
Reserved on: 01.10.2025
Pronounced on: 28.10.2025

Satpal Singh
...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India, Narcotics Control Bureau, Zonal Unit, Amritsar
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sharma (Hissarwale), Special Public Prosecutor, NCB with
Mr. Vinayak Atre, Advocate and
Ms. Indu Bala Sharma, Advocate
for the respondent-NCB.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

NCB Crime No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
6	28.12.2023	NCB Zonal Unit, Amritsar	8, 21, 23, 25, 27A, 29 & 60 of NDPS Act

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the crime case captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. Per paragraph 14A of the bail petition and the reply/custody certificate, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply filed by the NCB, the relevant portion of which reads as follows:

“2. That the brief facts of the case are that on 28.12.2023 at about 1115 Hrs. an information was received from Inspector Sanjay Singh Reg. No. 123503868 Offg. Coy Commander, BOP-Ghoga, 183BN BSF Amritsar by Sh. Balwant Rai, Inspector, NCB, Zonal Unit, Amritsar that the troops of BOP-Ghoga, 183Bn, BSF Ajnala, Amritsar had apprehended some persons (Indian Nationals) along with one motorcycle and recovered two packets of narcotic substance from their possession which a drone has dropped the same under the jurisdiction of BOP- Ghoga and the BSF wants to hand over the same to NCB, Amritsar for further legal

CRM-M-33594-2025

proceedings as per law.”

4. The petitioner's counsel refers to the bail petition and submits that Suchha Singh is the main accused.

5. 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.

6. Counsel for the NCB opposes bail and refers to following portion of the reply, which reads as follows:-

“That, in his voluntary statement, Satpal Singh, S/o Deelip @ Dalip Singh (one of the co-accused) admitted the manner and factum of recovery seized 0.820kg of Heroin and his involvement in the trafficking of Heroin. He further revealed that he is the brother of Sucha Singh and his mobile number is 9517766416. On 27.12.2023, Sucha Singh told him that some packets of Heroin were to come through a drone from Pakistan Side on 28.12.2023 in the early morning. For this work, his brother Sucha Singh was to give him Rs. 10,000/-. Thereafter he and Sucha Singh reached at the house of Balwinder Singh, S/o-Ujagar Singh. The house of Balwinder Singh is his village, there all of them planned that they would go by the motorcycle of Balwinder Singh. The registration number of motorcycle is PB-02CK-4956. As per plan of Sucha Singh S/o Dalip Singh, he along with Balwinder Singh and Sucha Singh had reached at Sarwan Singh' village Bhindi Nain on 27.12.2023 at night by the motorcycle bearing number PB-02CK-4956 of Balwinder Singh and they all stayed at the House of Sarwan Singh S/o - Heera Singh, at night where they all planned to collect the consignment of Heroin which was to be dropped by a drone near fencing of Indo-Pak Border from Pakistan side. On 28.12.2023 in the early morning around 0630hrs, as per plan of Sucha Singh, he along with Balwinder Singh, Sarwan Singh and Sucha Singh went near border fencing near farm field of sugarcane to collect the packets of Heroin where after sometime 02 packets of Heroin was dropped by a drone from Pakistan side and they collected the packets of Heroin and handed over to Sucha Singh who further handed over to Balwinder Singh who kept both the packets of Heroin in his jacket. Thereafter, Balwinder Singh and Sucha Singh sit over the motorcycle bearing reg. no. PB02-CK-4956 and went towards the house of Sarwan Singh. The motorcycle was being driven by Balwinder Singh.”

REASONING:

7. As per paragraph 1 of the reply, the contraband is 820 grams of heroin.

8. Dealing in 820 grams of heroin in contravention of the NDPS Act, 1985, constitutes

CRM-M-33594-2025

an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

Substance Name	Heroin/ Chitta/ Smack/ Brown Sugar/ Diacetylmorphine
Quantity detained	820 Gram
Punishable U/s	S.21(c) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Commercial
Drug Quantity in % to upper limit of Intermediate	328.00%

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	
Commercial Quantity	> 250 Gram	

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 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. Section 37¹ of the NDPS Act mandates under sub-section (1) (b) of section 37 that no person accused of an offense punishable for offenses involving commercial quantity shall be released on bail unless- (i) the Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application of release, and (ii) where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the Court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that accused is not guilty of such offense and is not likely to commit any offense while on bail. Thus, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case, and the burden is on the petitioner to satisfy the twin conditions put in place by the Legislature under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Given the legislative mandate of S. 37 of the NDPS Act, the Court can release a person accused of an offense punishable under the NDPS Act for possessing a commercial quantity of contraband only after recording reasonable

¹ **37. Offences to be cognizable and non-bailable.**—(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974),—
(a) every offence punishable under this Act shall be cognizable;
(b) no person accused of an offence punishable for offences under section 19 or section 24 or section 27A and also for offences involving commercial quantity shall be released on bail or on his own bond unless—
(i) the Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for such release, and (ii) where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.
(2) The limitations on granting of bail specified in clause (b) of sub-section (1) are in addition to the limitations under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or any other law for the time being in force on granting of bail.

CRM-M-33594-2025

satisfaction of its rigors.

11. The NCB's Counsel argues that a plain reading of Section 37 reveals that the legislature intends to make the law stringent to curb the drug menace. It is further to be noticed that the provisions are couched in negative language, meaning that to grant bail, the Court needs to record a finding that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioner is not guilty of the offense. The burden of proof is also on the petitioner to satisfy the Court about his non-involvement in the case. While interpreting the provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act, the Court must be guided by the objective sought to be achieved by putting these stringent conditions.

12. 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 exist, and the factors for bail become similar to the bail petitions under general penal statutes like IPC. 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 them 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 an offense and is not likely to commit any offense while on bail. If either of these 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 the accused is not guilty of the alleged offense. Even on fulfilling one of the conditions, the reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such an offense, the Court still cannot give a finding on the assurance that the accused is not likely to commit any such crime again.

13. The petitioner's arguments did not point toward any material contradictions.

14. The recovery is from the petitioner and the co-accused.

15. The recovery was made by the officials of BSF, who are least likely to have any motive for false implication or any prejudice against their fellow citizens, for whose protection they patrol and guard the borders.

16. The submissions made above and the grounds in the bail petition do not shift the burden the legislature places on the accused under S. 37 of the NDPS Act. The petitioner has not stated anything in the bail petition to discharge the burden put by the stringent conditions placed in the statute by the legislature under section 37 of the NDPS Act. The investigation reveals sufficient prima facie evidence to connect the petitioner with the

CRM-M-33594-2025

crime; thus, the petitioner fails to make out a case for bail. Any detailed discussions about the evidence may prejudice the case of the petitioner, the State, or the other accused.

17. In *Union of India (NCB) v. Khalil Uddin*, decided on 21 Oct 2022, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 2109, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

[4]. According to the prosecution, contraband material weighing about 13 kgs. of morphine was found in a motor vehicle which was driven by co-accused named Md. Jakir Hussain. During the course of investigation, it was found that the motor vehicle was recorded in the name of Md. Nizam Uddin who had executed a sale letter and handed over the custody of the vehicle to accused Md. Abdul Hai and that accused Md. Jakir Hussain was the driver employed by accused Md. Abdul Hai and that contraband material in question was to be handed over to accused-Khalil Uddin, an owner of a tea shop.

[5]. The High Court by its order which is presently under challenge, directed release of both the accused as stated above on bail after they had undergone custody to the tune of about a year. Questioning grant of relief to said accused, the instant appeals have been preferred.

[7]. What emerges from the record is that large quantity of contraband weighing about 13 kgs of morphine was found in a car which was driven by Md. Jakir Hussain. Whether the role played by said Md. Jakir Hussain could get connected with both the accused is a question.

[8]. The answer to said question could be the statement recorded of Md. Nizam Uddin. The statement of Md. Jakir Hussain recorded under Section 67 of the Act has also named his owner accused Abdul Hai. We are conscious of the fact that the validity and scope of such statements under Section 67 has been pronounced upon by this Court in *Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu*. In *State by (NCB) Bengaluru v. Pallulabid Ahmad Arimutta*, the rigour of law lay down by this Court in *Tofan Singh* was held to be applicable even at the stage of grant of bail.

[9]. However, going by the circumstances on record, at this stage, on the strength of the statement of Md. Nizam Uddin, though allegedly retracted later, the matter stands on a different footing. In our considered view, in the face of the mandate of Section 37 of the Act, the High Court could not and ought not to have released the accused on bail. We, therefore, allow these appeals, set aside the view taken by the High Court and direct that both the appellants be taken in custody forthwith.

[10]. We have been given to understand that the charge-sheet has been filed. In the circumstances, we direct the Trial Court to take up the matter and conclude the proceedings as early as possible and preferably within six months from the receipt of this order.

18. In *Narayan Takri v. State of Odisha*, decided on 10 Sep 2024, SLP (Crl.) 8198-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

The petitioners are in custody since 28th May, 2022 for alleged commission of alleged offence under Section 20(b)(ii)(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. As per the

CRM-M-33594-2025

FIR allegation, 125.3 kg. of “Ganja” was recovered from the petitioners.

[3]. It is not in dispute that the trial has commenced and that three prosecution witnesses have been examined till date.

[4]. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the third prosecution witness was examined as far back as on 28th January, 2024 and since then, no other prosecution witness has been examined. There is, however, no such averment in the petition.

[5]. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent submits that every endeavor shall be made on behalf of the prosecution to have all the witnesses examined by the end of this year.

[6]. The trial court is encouraged to expedite the trial and give its decision as early as possible, in accordance with law.

[7]. We, however, do not see any reason to interfere the impugned judgment and order at this stage; however, it is clarified that in the event the trial is not completed by the end of this year, the petitioners shall be at liberty to renew their prayer for bail before the trial court.

19. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for bail. The impact of crime would also not justify bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

20. The petitioner's custody of around 01 year 08 months & 30 days as per the custody certificate dated 30.09.2025, cannot be termed prolonged, given the minimum sentence prescribed for the offense.

21. Regarding the delay in the trial, if the trial does not conclude within two years of the petitioner's custody, and the delay is not attributable to the petitioner, the petitioner may apply for bail before the trial Court. The trial Court shall not be influenced by the dismissal of bail by this Court as well as by the earlier orders passed by the Trial Court, or on merits or by criminal history and shall decide it on changed circumstances and the prolonged trial.

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

23. Petition dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

28.10.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: YES.