

CRM-M-45554-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-45554-2025
Reserved on: 10.09.2025
Pronounced on: 24.09.2025

Nishan Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
09	01.03.2025	Chattiwind, District Amritsar Rural	21, 27A/29 of NDPS Act and Section 111(1) of BNS 2023

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. Per paragraph 10 of the bail petition as well as custody certificate dated 09.09.2025 and also para 9 of the reply filed by the State, petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply filed by the State. On 01-03-2025, based on a chance recovery, the Police seized 15 grams of heroin and drug money of Rs 1710/- from the petitioner's possession. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements of the NDPS Act, 1985, and BNSS 2023.
4. The petitioner's counsel seeks bail on the grounds of prolonged pretrial custody.
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 their family. Counsel further 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,

CRM-M-45554-2025

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.

6. The State’s counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

REASONING:

7. As per paragraph 6 of the reply, the contraband is 15 grams of heroin.

8. Dealing in 15 grams of heroin in contravention of the NDPS Act, 1985, constitutes an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

Substance Name	Heroin/ Chitta/ Smack/ Brown Sugar/ Diacetylmorphine
Quantity detained	15 Gram
Punishable U/s	S.21(b) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Intermediate
Drug Quantity in % to upper limit of Intermediate	6.00%

Drug's Small & Commercial Qty. suggested by Committee report	
Notification No. & date	Expert Committee Report dated 24.03.1995 & 23.08.2001 (Small and Commercial)

Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985		
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	

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. Per the custody certificate dated 09.09.2025 the petitioner's custody in this FIR is of 06 months & 06 days.

CRM-M-45554-2025

10. 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.

11. The law of bail, like any other branch of law, has its own philosophy, and occupies an important place in the administration of justice and the concept of bail emerges from the conflict between the police power to restrict liberty of a man who is alleged to have committed a crime, and presumption of innocence in favour of the alleged criminal.² In deciding bail applications an important factor which should certainly be taken into consideration by the Court is the delay in concluding the trial.—Often this takes several years, and if the accused is denied bail but is ultimately acquitted, who will restore so many years of his life spent in custody? —Is Article 21 of the Constitution, which is the most basic of all the fundamental rights in our Constitution, not violated in such a case? —Of course this is not the only factor, but it is certainly one of the important factors in deciding whether to grant bail.³ Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.⁴ Personal liberty deprived when bail is refused, is too precious a value of our constitutional system recognised under Art. 21 that the curial power to negate it is a great trust exercisable, not casually, but judicially with lively concern for the cost to the individual and the community.⁵ When the undertrial prisoners are detained in jail custody to an indefinite period, Article 21 of the Constitution is violated.⁶

12. However, the police claim that the police had also recovered Rs. 1710/-. To understand the facts that led to the recovery of money, it shall be relevant to extract para 6 of the reply, which reads as follows:

“Evidence against the petitioner

6. That it is humbly submitted that petitioner was apprehended in the present case with a direct recovery of 15 grams of heroin and drug money of Rs.1710/- by the investigating officer.”

13. A perusal of FIR does not point out that how such a petty amount was the proceeds of drugs sale. The police had no evidence to term such money as drug money, and

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

² Supreme Court of India in Vaman Narain Ghiya v. state of Rajasthan, [E-SCR] ; [2008] 17 SCR 369, Para 16, decided on 12.12.2008.

³ Supreme Court of India in State of Kerala v. Raneef, SC 2J [E-SCR]; [2011] 1 SCR 590, Para 4, decided on 03.01.2011.

⁴ Supreme Court of India in Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, SC 2J [E-SCR], Paragraph 127, decided on 02.12.2010.

⁵ Supreme Court of India in Babu Singh & ors v. State of UP, [E-SCR] P. 777, decided on 31.01.1978.

⁶ Supreme Court of India in Sanjay Chandra v. CBI , [2011] 13 (ADDL.) S.C.R. 309, Para 26, [E-SCR], decided on 23.11.2011.

CRM-M-45554-2025

forgetting the statutory mandate of S. 23 (1) and (2) of BSA, 2023, invoked the stringent penal provision of S. 27-A just to trigger the legislative restrictions placed on bail through S. 37 of NDPS Act. In such a background, S. 37 of the NDPS Act shall neither attract in law nor through its inclusion in the FIR.

14. S. 27A of the NDPS Act reads as follows:

27A. Punishment for financing illicit traffic and harbouring offenders.—Whoever indulges in financing, directly or indirectly, any, of the activities specified in sub-clauses (i) to (v) of 3[clause (viii**b**) of section 2] or harbours any person engaged in any of the aforementioned activities, shall be punishable with rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than ten years but which may extend to twenty years and shall also be liable to fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to two lakh rupees:

Provided that the court may, for reasons to be recorded in the judgment, impose a fine exceeding two lakh rupees.

15. At the stage of invocation of S. 27A, there was no *prima facie* evidence of financing, directly or indirectly. Thus, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act shall also not attract.

16. When the restrictions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act do not attract, the factors for bail become similar to the offence regular statutes.

17. 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:

18. 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 25,000.

19. 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 25,000/-, 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

CRM-M-45554-2025

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.

20. 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)

21. This order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms.

22. 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 Court.

23. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect detection squad, the members of society, 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.

24. 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,

CRM-M-45554-2025

conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed.”

25. 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.”

26. 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.

27. 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 concerned 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.

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

29. It is clarified that this bail order shall not be considered as a blanket bail order in any other matter and is only limited to granting bail in the FIR mentioned above.

30. 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.”

31. Petition allowed in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

24.09.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.