

2025:PHHC:178899



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

201

CRM-M-46264-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 24.12.2025

Sandeep Singh ...Petitioner  
  
Versus  
State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Jaskirat Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to him in case arising out of FIR No. 28 dated 01.03.2025, registered under Sections 22, 27(a) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.
2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 01.03.2025, co-accused Harpreet Kaur and petitioner Sandeep Singh were apprehended by a police party and recovery of 80 loose intoxicating tablets and an amount of Rs.1 Lakh was effected from them. Upon interrogation, they disclosed that they used to purchase the intoxicating drugs from co-accused Saurav Kumar. On the basis of the same, he was also nominated in this case as accused and was arrested on 06.03.2025. Sample parcels were sent to FSL for chemical examination and it was found that the

2025:PHHC:178899



recovered tablets were containing *Clonazepam* and the total weight of the tablets came to be 10.88 grams. Offence under Section 22(B) of the NDPS Act was also added on 25.04.2025. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, *challan* has been presented in the Court on 29.04.2025 and presently, the petitioner along with co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The alleged recovery of the contraband effected in this case was in fact planted one. Mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with. The petitioner is in custody since 01.03.2025. More so, the quantity of the recovered contraband does not fall under commercial quantity. Even otherwise, investigation stands completed and *challan* has been filed on 29.04.2025. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time. Similarly situated co-accused Harpreet Kaur has been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. On parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report as well as the custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by the respondent-State. It is argued by learned State counsel that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. He is not entitled to get benefit of bail. It is, thus, urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner along with co-accused Harpreet Kaur is alleged to be found in conscious possession of aforementioned intoxicant tablets and drug

2025:PHHC:178899



money of Rs.1 Lakh on 01.03.2025. A perusal of the record reveals that co-accused Harpreet Kaur has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. Investigation stands completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial would likely take some time. The petitioner is in custody since 01.03.2025. Keeping in view the aforementioned facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner into 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.

7. 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.

24.12.2025

*Waseem Ansari*

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned*

*Yes/No*

*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*