

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-38719-2025
Reserved on: 07.08.2025
Pronounced on: 26.08.2025

Gurjinder Singh @ Ghuggi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Preet Harinder Singh Pannu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
51	29.03.2025	Jandiala, Distt. Amritsar Rural	21/27(A)/29 of NDPS Act and Section 111(1) of BNS

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. As per paragraph 15 of the bail application the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the order dated 08.05.2025 passed by the Special Court dismissing the bail application of the petitioner. On 29.03.2025, based on chance recovery, the Police seized 15 grams heroin and Rs.1500/- of drug money from the co-accused Shamsher Singh @ Shera's possession. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements of the NDPS Act, 1985, and BNSS, 2025. During the custodial interrogation of the accused Shamsher Singh @ Shera in his second disclosure statement, he disclosed the name of petitioner; based on such disclosure statement, the police arraigned the petitioner as an accused by incorporating S. 29 of the NDPS Act, 05 grams of heroin was also recovered from the present petitioner.
4. The petitioner's counsel submits that name of the petitioner has been surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of the main accused, namely, Shamsher Singh @ Shera and the benefit of regular bail has already been granted to the said main accused by this Court, vide order dated 18.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-34380-2025.
5. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and

contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his family.

6. The petitioner’s counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

7. The State’s counsel opposes bail on instructions.

REASONING:

8. As per the order of the trial Court, the name of the contraband is heroin and its weight is 20 grams, and it constitutes an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

Substance Name	Heroin/ Chitta/ Smack/ Brown Sugar/ Diacetylmorphine
Quantity detained	20 Gram
Quantity type	Intermediate
<i>Drug Quantity in % to upper limit of Intermediate</i>	6.00%

<i>Drug's Small & Commercial Qty. suggested by Committee report</i>	
Notification No. & date	Expert Committee Report dated 24.03.1995 & 23.08.2001 (Small and Commercial)
Punishable U/s	S.21(b) of NDPS Act, 1985

<i>Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985</i>		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1055(E)	10/19/2001
Sr. No.	56	
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	Heroin	

Other non-proprietary name	*****
Chemical Name	Diacetylmorphine
Small Quantity	< 5 Gram
Commercial Quantity	> 250 Gram

0

Declared as punishable under NDPS Act and as per schedule defined in S.2(xi) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985		
Notification No. & dated	S.(xvi)(d) NDPS Act, 1985 (61 of 1985), S.O. 821 (E)	11/14/1985

Sr. No.	2(xvi)(d)
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	*****
Other non-proprietary name	*****
Chemical Name	2(xvi)(d) diacetylmorphine, that is, the alkaloid also known as dia-morphine or heroin and its salts; Explanation.-- For the purposes of clauses (v) (vi), (xv) and (xvi) the percentages in the case of liquid preparations shall be calculated on the basis that a preparation containing one per cent. of a substance means a preparation in which one gram of substance, if solid, or one mililitre of substance, if liquid, is contained in every one hundred mililitre of the preparation and so on in proportion for any greater or less percentage: Provided that the Central Government may, having regard to the developments in the field of methods of calculating percentages in liquid preparations prescribed, by rules, any other basis which it may deem appropriate for such calculation.

9. The quantity involved in this case is not commercial. Thus Section 37 NDPS would not apply.

10. Section 2 (vii-a) of the NDPS Act defines commercial quantity as the quantity greater than the quantity specified in the schedule. Section 2 (xxiii-a) defines a small

quantity as a quantity less than the quantity specified in the table of the NDPS Act. The remaining quantity falls in an undefined category, generally called an intermediate quantity. All sections in the NDPS Act specify an offence and mention the minimum and maximum sentence, depending upon the quantity of the substance. The commercial quantity mandates a minimum sentence of ten years of imprisonment and a minimum fine of Rupees One hundred thousand, and bail is subject to the riders mandated in S. 37 of the NDPS Act. When the quantity is less than commercial, the restrictions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act will not attract, and the factors for bail become similar to the offence regular statutes.

11. The petitioner is entitled to bail because when the quantity involved was either more or closer to the quantity seized in the present FIR, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has granted bail on prolonged custody in the following judicial precedent:

12. In *Rajesh v. The State of Haryana*, decided on 20-11-2024, SLP (Crl) 14037-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

The petitioner is an accused in a case bearing FIR No.67 dated 25.01.2024 registered with Police Station Majesar, District Faridabad, Haryana for the offences punishable under Section 20 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act (hereinafter called "NDPS"). The allegation against the petitioner is that there is an alleged recovery of 1.200 kgs of ganja (contraband article) from him. The bail application of the petitioner was dismissed by the High Court. He has already undergone about 10 months in jail. Being aggrieved, he approached this Court.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondent State.

The bail has not been granted by the High Court only for the reason that the petitioner is a habitual offender. Although, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that out of four cases, there is only one case of NDPS against the petitioner and the remaining cases (three in number) relate to Excise Act and not of NDPS.

Under these circumstances, considering the quantity of the contraband article and the period of incarceration of the petitioner, we are of the opinion that a case of bail is made out for the petitioner.

13. As per paragraph 9 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 31.03.2025. As per the custody certificate dated 06.08.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 04 months and 05 days. Given the penal provisions invoked vis-à-vis pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, quantity of contraband involved and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

14. The prolonged incarceration, generally militates against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and in such a situation, the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37(1)

(b)(ii) of the NDPS Act¹.

15. Following the judicial precedent mentioned above, without commenting on the case's merits, and considering the petitioner's pre-trial custody, the weight of the drugs, coupled with the other factors peculiar to this case, further pre-trial incarceration is not justified at this stage, subject to the terms and conditions of this order. However, this order shall take effect from the time it is uploaded to this Court's official webpage.

CONDITIONS:

16. Given the above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate or duty Magistrate, with or without sureties, with a maximum bond amount not to exceed INR 10,000.

17. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, the surety is capable of producing the accused. However, instead of surety, the petitioner may provide a fixed deposit of INR 10,000/-, with a clause that the interest shall not be accumulated in FD, either drawn from a State-owned bank or any bank listed on the National Stock Exchange and/or Bombay Stock Exchange, in favour of the "Chief Judicial Magistrate" of the concerned Sessions Division; or a fixed deposit made in the name of the petitioner, with similar terms and with endorsement from the banker stating that the FD shall not be encumbered or redeemed without the permission of the concerned trial Court, or until the surety bond has been discharged.

18. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

19. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

20. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the

¹ Supreme Court of India, in Rabi Prakash v. The State of Odisha, SLP (Crl) 4169-2023, Para 4, decided on 13 July 2023

Court.

21. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the members of society, detection squad and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of release from prison and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

22. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense and also to block the menace of drug abuse. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

23. In *Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal*, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, the Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

24. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

25. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial, or violates S. 19, 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, or commits any non-bailable

offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the Special Judge/ Sessions Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

26. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

27. In Amit Rana v. State of Haryana, CRM-18469-2025 [in CRA-D-123-2020, decided on 05.08.2025], a Division Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court in paragraph 13, holds that “To ensure that every person in judicial custody who has been granted bail or whose sentence has been suspended gets back their liberty without any delay, it is appropriate that whenever the bail order or the orders of suspension of sentence are not immediately sent by the Registry, computer systems, or Public Prosecutor, then in such a situation, to facilitate the immediate restoration of the liberty granted by any Court, the downloaded copies of all such orders, subject to verification, must be accepted by the Court before whom the bail bonds are furnished.”

28. **Petition allowed in terms mentioned above.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE**

**26.08.2025
Jyoti-II**

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.