

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

2025:PHHC:112398



(242)

CRM-M-45147-2025

Date of decision: 25.08.2025

Paramdeep Singh @ Raja

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr.Nikhil Ghai, Advocate,
Mr.Armaan Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Baljinder Singh Sra,Addl.A.G., Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL):

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.58 dated 11.05.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 21-B, 27-A, 29,25 of NDPS Act at Police Station Sultanwind, District Amritsar.
2. The gravamen of the FIR in question pertains to recovery of 45 grams of heroin and Rs.3000/- of drug money from the petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the alleged recovery of 45 grams of heroin is non-commercial and therefore, grant of bail is not restricted by rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Learned counsel has further argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the

FIR in question on account of a confessional statement. Learned counsel has further submitted that police has invoked Section 27(a) of the NDPS Act by alleging that the recovery of Rs.3000/- from the petitioner is drug money. Learned counsel has argued that the mandatory provisions of Section 27(a) of the NDPS Act has not been complied with scrupulously. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature as recovery of 45 grams of heroin and drug money amounting to Rs.3000/- is involved and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 25.8.2025 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 11.05.2025 and is in custody since then. The rival contentions of the parties give rise to debatable issues which shall essentially be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. The FIR in question primarily relates to magisterial trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the investigation/trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the appellant absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the remaining prosecution evidence.

As per the custody certificate dated 25.08.2025 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 3 months and 12 days.

Suffice to say, the further detention of the petitioner in custody is not required in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqha Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the

State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

- 9. Ordered accordingly.
- 10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
- 11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

August 25, 2025
sailesh

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