



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

249

CRM-M-36928 of 2025

Date of decision: 21.07.2025

Harmandeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. H. S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.08 dated 08.01.2025 under Sections 21, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station STF SAS Nagar Mohali, District SAS Nagar (Mohali), Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that 354 grams of heroin was recovered from one Natasha and Vishal who upon disclosure statement named the present petitioner to be supplier of the said contraband.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case as there is no evidence apart from the disclosure statement of co-accused. The petitioner is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 6 months and 09 days as under trial. 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. H. S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 6 months and 09 days.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that trial is likely to take time for its conclusion; there is no evidence apart from the disclosure statement of co-accused, 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 fit 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 ordered to be released on regular bail on her 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 petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

21.07.2025
anil

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