



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

248

CRM-M-36892 of 2025
Date of decision: 21.07.2025

Nirmal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Kamal Narula, 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 in case FIR No.76 dated 27.06.2024 under Sections 21, 22, 29 of NDPS Act (and Section 341(2) of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Makhu, District Ferozepur (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that co-accused of the petitioner Harpreet Singh and Gurwinder Singh were found in possession of 2500 tablets of Clovvidal-100 SR containing salt Tramadol Hydrochloride while they were travelling on motorcycle bearing registration No.PB-05U-1165. Petitioner has been named by co-accused in their disclosure statement along with one Gurtej Singh. The said Gurtej Singh has been granted anticipatory bail by this court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case as apart from disclosure statement, there is no evidence to connect the petitioner from the contraband at this



stage. He further submits that petitioner is in custody for the last 9 months and 29 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 9 months and 29 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 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 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