



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

236

CRM-M-36383 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.07.2025

Nirmal Singh @ Nimma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate, and
Mr. Keshav Chadha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS of 2023 in case FIR No.80 dated 11.10.2022, under Sections 21 and 29 of NDPS Act 1985 and Sections 25(6), 27(7) (i) of Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 10, 11, 12 of Aircraft Act, 1934, registered at Police Station Valtaha, District Tarn Taran, Punjab.

2. The case of the prosecution is that petitioner along with co-accused were indulged in smuggling of heroin from Pakistan. The petitioner was found in possession of 510 grams heroin and co-accused namely Gursewak Singh @ Sewak Singh was also apprehended with 490 grams heroin.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per custody certificate, petitioner is in custody for the last 2 years, 8 months and 29 days and out of 14 prosecution witnesses only 6 have been examined so far. He further submits that petitioner is not involved in any other case and co-accused has been granted bail by this Court. Trial is likely to take time for



its conclusion and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate dated 16.07.2025, the petitioners are in custody for 2 years, 8 months and 29 days.

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

7. In view of the above submission of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that out of 14 witnesses, 6 have examined and co-accused has been released on bail; trial is likely to take a long time, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioners misuse the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

17.07.2025
anil

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