

2025:PHHC:151655



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

226

**CRM-M-33652-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.11.2025**

Jugraj Singh @ Ghachu**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

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

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

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. 03 dated 07.01.2022, registered under Sections 22(C), 21(C) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station Chattiwind, District Amritsar. The previous petition of the petitioner was dismissed by this Court on 13.02.2025. The operative part of the order dated 13.02.2025 reads as under :

“6. As per the allegations, the petitioner was apprehended by the police party and the recovery of 753 intoxicant tablets of Tramadol Hydrochloride was effected from him. Awaiting the FSL report, he was granted interim bail but on receipt of the same, his bail was cancelled on 26.09.2023. A perusal of the status report as well as the custody certificate of the petitioner shows that he is involved in one more case under the NDPS Act, apart

2025:PHHC:151655



from two cases under the Excise Act and two cases under the provisions of IPC, including Section 302 of IPC. The petitioner seems to be a habitual offender. Even otherwise, the quantity of the contraband recovered from the petitioner falls within the commercial quantity. Hence, the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act would certainly be attracted against him as nothing has been placed on record before this Court so as to believe that he did not commit the subject offence or in case, he is released on bail, he would not commit any such or similar offence. The apprehension of learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that if extended benefit of bail, the petitioner may abscond or indulge in similar offences cannot be stated to be unfounded keeping in view his criminal antecedents. Trial is going on and there is nothing on record to suggest that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of trial. The arguments raised by learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to lacunas in the investigation cannot be looked into at this stage as the same is to be decided by the learned trial Court after appreciating the entire evidence and material placed on record before it. Keeping in view the gravity of allegations as levelled against the petitioner, his criminal antecedents, the quantity of alleged contraband recovered from him, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the considered opinion that he does not deserve to be granted concession of regular bail, at this stage. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.”

2. The only argument which has been raised by learned counsel for the petitioner for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is that extended period of incarceration has entitled the petitioner to be released on bail and

2025:PHHC:151655



therefore, it is urged by him that the petition deserves to be allowed.

3. *Per contra*, it is argued by learned State counsel that the previous petition as filed by the petitioner was dismissed by passing a detailed order by this Court by taking into consideration the contentions raised by both sides. It is submitted that no new change in the circumstances has been pointed out. The mere extended period of incarceration alone is not sufficient to grant benefit of bail to the petitioner. Apart from the present case, the petitioner is facing trial in a murder case. The allegations against him are quite serious in nature. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

4. This Court has heard the submissions made by both the sides.

5. The previous petition as filed by the petitioner for grant of regular bail had been dismissed by this Court by passing a detailed order. The petitioner has criminal antecedents and is shown to be facing trial in a murder case as well. It is well settled proposition of law that when successive bail applications come before the Court, the Court should be very cautious while considering the same. Successive bail applications can be entertained by the Court when some substantial change is established by the accused thereby making him entitled for grant of bail. Reference in this regard can be made to ***State of Maharashtra Vs. Captain Buddhikota Subha Rao, AIR 1989 Supreme Court, 2292***, wherein it was observed so and it was further held that the Court should not pass an order of release of an accused on bail in successive bail application merely establishing some cosmetic change between time gap of two applications. There must be some drastic change during the period between two applications. Reference can

2025:PHHC:151655



also be made to *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav and another (2004) 7 SCC 528*, wherein it was observed by Hon’ble Supreme Court that where the offence alleged against an accused is grave, bail cannot be granted only on the ground of long incarceration.

6. After hearing the contentions as raised by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that no substantial or drastic change from the date of dismissal of the previous petition as moved by the petitioner has been pointed out or made out from the pleas taken by the petitioner. Merely the extended/prolonged period of incarceration or examination of some material witnesses is not a ground to extend any such benefit. There are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence as well as the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, in the considered opinion of this Court, it is not a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on bail, especially in view of the fact that no drastic or material change in the circumstances has been made out. In view of the discussion as made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.11.2025
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No