



CRM-M-38168-2025

-1-

111+
251**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-38168-2025 (O&M)**

Date of Decision: 06.08.2025

Gurwinder Singh @ Mithu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Sumeet Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioner (through VC).
Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**CRM-30397-2025**

Allowed as prayed for. Annexure A-1 is taken on record.

Main case

1. Present petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.56 dated 26.05.2023, under Sections 15, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Dirba, District Sangrur.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the police party while on patrolling on 26.05.2023, saw a truck coming from Patran side. The same was stopped and on asking the driver of the truck disclosed his named as Sukhjinder Singh @ Seera and the person sitting next to him disclosed his name as Gurwinder Singh @ Mithu (petitioner). On checking the cabin of the truck, two plastic bags were found and on checking the same, poppyhusk was found in them, which on weighing came to be 80 kgs. They failed to produce any licence regarding the possession of the same. Thus, on the registration of the FIR, both were arrested on the spot. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. The investigation commenced. The petitioner



approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 11.12.2023. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-28164-2024, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 06.05.2025. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Sukhjinder Singh @ Seera. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 30.07.2025 passed in **CRM-M-39430-2025**, whereby, co-accused Sukhjinder Singh @ Seera has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 26.05.2023. He submits that though the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Sukhjinder Singh @ Seera. He submits that out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 26.05.2023.



Co-accused, namely, Sukhjinder Singh @ Seera is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. As submitted before this Court, out of 14 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till and the petitioner is stated to be involved in one case, however, he is on bail.

6. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Mohd Muslim @ Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 LiveLaw(SC)260***, this Court is of the opinion that the case of the petitioner is covered by the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In the abovesaid case Hon'ble Supreme Court expressed its views as under:-

19. A plain and literal interpretation of the conditions under Section 37 (i.e., that Court should be satisfied that the accused is not guilty and would not commit any offence) would effectively exclude grant of bail altogether, resulting in punitive detention and unsanctioned preventive detention as well. Therefore, the only manner in which such special conditions as enacted under Section 37 can be considered within constitutional parameters is where the court is reasonably satisfied on a prima facie look at the material on record (whenever the bail application is made) that the accused is not guilty. Any other interpretation, would result in complete denial of the bail to a person accused of offences such as those enacted under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

20 xxxxx

21it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable.

22 xxxxx

23. There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, "as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal"²² (also see Donald Clemmer's 'The Prison Community' published in 1940²³).



Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials – especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up and concluded speedily.'

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.08.2025
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No