

2025:PHHC:129619



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

223

**CRM-M No.38363 of 2025
Date of Decision: 17.09.2025**

Bamber Singh @ Nikka @ Bember Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant one is the third petition as filed by the petitioner for grant of regular bail as filed by the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.23 dated 18.03.2024 registered under Sections 22(c), 27 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') at Police Station Balianwali, District Bathinda.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the allegations that on 18.03.2024, initially 2700 intoxicating tablets having salt of Tramadol Hydrochloride and then 500 tablets of same salt were recovered from the accused Pardeep Singh. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement that the intoxicating tablets had been supplied to him by the petitioner. The petitioner was nominated as an accused and was arrested on 31.03.2024. Presently, he along with the co-

2025:PHHC:129619



accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he is in custody since 31.03.2024. The prosecution case suffers from several material infirmities as there is neither any independent corroboration of the version of prosecution, neither recovery was effected in accordance with law. Infact, no recovery from conscious possession of the petitioner has been effected. He has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. After dismissal of his previous second petition, a period of about ten months has elapsed. However, only one prosecution witness has been examined so far. The trial will take considerable time. The period of his incarceration is a sufficient ground for grant of bail to him. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that the previous two petitions as filed by the petitioner within a gap of four months have been dismissed on 07.08.2024 and 28.11.2024 by passing a detailed orders. This is also successive bail application. There are serious allegations against the petitioner. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The instant one is the third petition for grant of regular bail as filed by the petitioner. His previous two petitions had been dismissed by passing detailed orders. He is even shown to have filed a Special Leave

2025:PHHC:129619



Petition before the Hon'ble Supreme Court which was withdrawn on 25.04.2025. It is well settled that mere extended/prolonged period of incarceration cannot be considered to be new or drastic change in the circumstances. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Keeping in view the above discussed facts, this Court is of the opinion that no ground for allowing the petition is made out. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

17.09.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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