



251 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-34078-2025

Date of Decision:12.08.2025

Ravi Singh alias Guri

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Amardeep Singh Mann, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.0359 dated 04.12.2024 registered under Sections 21(C), 25 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Sadar Mansa, District Mansa (Challan presented under Sections 21(c)/29/61/85 of NDPS Act, 1985).

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the present petitioner and Jagdeep Singh @ Jaggu were arrested by the police on 04.12.2024, while they were carrying 260 grams of heroin in their conscious possession without any permit or license.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case. He further submits that nothing has been recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 04.12.2024 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. Trial is likely to take long time. No useful purpose will be served by further

detention of the petitioner in custody. Thus, it is prayed that he may be released on regular bail. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgments in (i) **CRM-M-37684-2021, Balwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 14.02.2022; (ii) **CRM-M-8212-2022, Tajinder Singh vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 03.03.2022 and (iii) **CRM-M-35186-2016, Manjit Kaur @ Jeeto vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 01.12.2016.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that one more case under NDPS Act has been registered against him and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, custody period of the petitioner and also the fact that the quantity of alleged contraband is marginally above the 'commercial quantity', but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

7. Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

12.08.2025
hemlata

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No