



CRM-M-45030-2025

::1::

**(230) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-45030-2025

Date of Decision: 23.09.2025

JAGJEET SINGH ALIAS LADDI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Ms. Anshul Rana, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.109 dated 30.06.2024 registered under Sections 21B/22B/61/85 of NDPS Act at Police Station Garhshankar, Hoshiarpur.

2. The brief facts of the case are that Jagjeet Singh @ Laddi (petitioner) and Baljeet Singh @ Lavi were apprehended with 22 grams of heroin and 450 grams loose intoxicating tablets.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. There was a violation of the mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act regarding search and seizure including Section 50 of the NDPS Act. The prosecution version was inherently unbelievable. As the petitioner is in custody since 30.06.2024 but only 04 out of the 11 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the



CRM-M-45030-2025

::2::

Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. A short reply dated 22.09.2025 by way of an affidavit of Jaspreet Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur has been filed on behalf of the State by the learned counsel for the State. The same is taken on record. He contends that the petitioner was a habitual offender. He was an accused in 02 other cases arising out of FIR No.140 dated 14.10.2016 U/s 22/61/85 of NDPS Act P.S. Garhshankar, Hoshairpur and FIR No.181 dated 02.10.2022 U/s 22/61/85 of NDPS Act P.S. Garhshankar, Hoshiarpur. Therefore, keeping in view the antecedents of the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of bail, moreso in view of the bar contained in Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The details of other FIRs registered against the petitioner are as under:-

Sr. No.	FIR Nos. and date	Sections	Police Station
1.	FIR No.140 dated 14.10.2016	U/s 22/61/85 of NDPS Act	P.S. Garhshankar, Hoshairpur
2.	FIR No.181 dated 02.10.2022	U/s 22/61/85 of NDPS Act	P.S. Garhshankar, Hoshiarpur

7. Apparently, the petitioner is a serial offender with 02 other cases registered against him under the NDPS Act.



CRM-M-45030-2025

::3::

8. This Court in the case of **Soni Singh @ Chamkaur Singh Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-31645-2022, decided on 20.10.2022**, held as under:-

“Admittedly, the petitioner in the present case is named in the disclosure statement of the arrested accused. Subsequently thereto 3Kgs of Poppy Husk was recovered at his instance which is a non commercial quantity. It may be relevant to mention here that limitations to the grant of bail under Section 37 of the NDPS Act are in addition to those prescribed under Cr.PC or any other law inforce on the grant of bail as has been set out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Satpal Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2018(5) RCR (Criminal) 152. In the present case, the petitioner is involved in two other cases under the NDPS Act. Thus, as he is a habitual offender, he is not entitled to the grant of bail even under Section 439 Cr.PC keeping in view his antecedents. Even otherwise, assuming that the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act did not apply to the petitioner, that by itself would not ipso facto lead to the grant of bail to the petitioner.

In view of the above discussion, I find no merit in the present petition and the same is therefore dismissed.”

9. Keeping in view the allegations levelled against the petitioner as well as his antecedents the satisfaction under Section 37 of the NDPS Act that he has not committed an offence and is not likely to commit one in the future cannot be recorded.

10. In view of the above discussion, I do not deem it appropriate to grant him the concession of bail and therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

2025:PHHC:132312



CRM-M-45030-2025

::4::

13. However, the Trial Court is directed to conclude the Trial as expeditiously as possible but in any case not later than 06 months from the next date of hearing fixed before it.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

23.09.2025

JITESH

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No