

2025:PHHC:135211



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

235

CRM-M-44373-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 26.09.2025

Sunny Singh @ Sunny**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Nikhil Thamman, Advocate and
Ms. Sunaina, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 147 dated 17.10.2023, registered under Sections 21 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Jhabal, District Tarn Taran.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that on 17.10.2023, on the basis of a secret information, the petitioner and co-accused Sachinpreet Singh and Vishal Singh, while coming on a motorcycle, was apprehended by a police party and recovery of 273 grams of heroin was effected from the toolbox of the vehicle, whereas on personal search of the petitioner, recovery of one pistol of .32 bore along with two live cartridges of .32 bore was effected. They were formally arrested at the spot. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities,

2025:PHHC:135211



challan was presented on 15.04.2024 in the Court and presently, the petitioner is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is not involved in any other case and has clean antecedents. Mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with properly. No independent witness was joined at the time of effecting alleged recovery. Even otherwise, investigation has been completed long back and *challan* has been presented in Court. However, trial is substantially delayed as despite the fact that *challan* was presented on 15.04.2024, out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far and there is no likelihood of the trial being completed in near future. The petitioner is in custody since 17.10.2023. In view of substantial delay in trial, the petitioner is entitled to get benefit of bail. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the record carefully.

6. As per the allegations, the petitioner along with above named co-accused was found to be in possession of 273 grams of heroin and one pistol of .32 bore along with its two live cartridges. The petitioner is in custody since the date of registration of the FIR. On going through the record, it is apparent that the trial is substantially delayed as only 01 prosecution witness has been

2025:PHHC:135211



examined so far out of total 15 witnesses, despite the fact that challan was presented way back 15.04.2024. The petitioner has been in long incarceration of about two years\.. The trial is obviously delayed and there is no likelihood of the same to conclude in near future. Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rabi Prakash vs. State of Odisha : 2023 Live Law (SC) 533*** has held that 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 Act. Similar view has been taken by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ankur Chaudhary vs. State of Madhya Pradesh : 2024 (4) RCR (Criminal) 172***. Reliance can also be placed upon ***Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain vs. State (NCT of Delhi) : 2023 AIR(SC) 1648 2023 AIR(SC) 1648***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court, while granting concession of regular bail to an accused, from whom commercial quantity of the contraband was allegedly recovered, has held that grant of bail on the ground of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Reference can also be made to the authority cited as ***Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another, 2022(10) SCC 51***, wherein similar observations were made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Reliance can also be placed upon the authority cited as ***Bhupender Singh vs. Narcotic Control Bureau : (2022) 2 RCR (Criminal) 706***, wherein a Division Bench of this Court, after considering issue with respect to achieving balance between right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors enumerated under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, has held that convict/accused is not precluded from claiming bail invoking parameters of Article 21 of the Constitution of India *de-hors* the stringent provisions of

2025:PHHC:135211



Section 37 of the NDPS Act. In the present case, apparently and evidently, the trial is substantially delayed. Therefore, keeping in view the aforementioned facts and circumstances and also the ratio of law as laid down in the aforecited authorities, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

26.09.2025
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No