

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:153385



227

CRM-M-38068-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:06.11.2025

Surinder Singh @ Sunny

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. G.S. Minhas, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The instant one is the second petition as filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the BNSS seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.103, dated 19.10.2023, under Section 21(c) of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Jalandhar Cantt, Jalandhar. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-43951-2024 has been dismissed by passing a detailed order vide order dated 17.12.2024.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 19.10.2023, the petitioner was apprehended by a police party headed by ASI Harbhajan Singh and recovery of 180 tablets of ELPRAFRESH- 0.5 MG (Etizolam), 110 tablets of TRAMATRUST SR-100 and 60 tablets of CLOVEDOL SR-100 (both containing Tramadol Hydrochloride) was effected from him. He was formally arrested at the spot.

After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that ever since the date of dismissal of his previous petition, a period of more than 10 months has elapsed, however, the trial has not concluded yet. The prolonged incarceration of the petitioner is a sufficient ground for seeking release of bail. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that the trial has almost concluded since the prosecution evidence has already been recorded and the case is at the stage of producing defence evidence. The trial will not take any further time to conclude. The previous petition was dismissed by making a detailed discussion. No fresh ground for grant of bail is made out. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the record.

6. The record reflects that commercial quantity of contraband was duly recovered from the possession of the petitioner. It is pertinent to note that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court seeking similar relief, however, his previous petition was dismissed vide a detailed and reasoned order dated 17.12.2024. Since then, there has been no material change in circumstances that would warrant a different view at this stage. The prosecution evidence now stands duly concluded, and the trial itself is at its fag end. In view of the above facts and the stage of the trial, this Court finds no justifiable ground to grant concession of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this petition is found to be devoid of merit and is hereby

dismissed.

7. It is, however, 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 hte case.

06.11.2025
harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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