



CRM-M-52081-2024

-1-

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

CRM-M-52081-2024

Date of Decision: 24.04.2025

Darshan Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Abhaysher Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.294 dated 23.09.2023 under Sections 22 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Special Task Force, District STF Wing SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that on 23.09.2023, the police received a secret information to the effect that Darshan Singh (petitioner) is indulged in business of selling intoxicant tablets and presently residing at Sohangerh Rattewala in the house of Rano widow of Bhawan Singh. In case of raid, he could be arrested alongwith the contraband. On receiving the information, the raiding team was constituted and house as disclosed was raided by the police party. On conducting raid, the petitioner as disclosed was found and on his disclosure, intoxicant tablets kept in black coloured polythene lying underneath the brick inside the wall of baranda of the house was recovered. On counting the same, 1110 tablets of tramadol were recovered. He failed to produce any licence regarding possession of the same and thus, the FIR was registered and he was arrested on the spot.



Samples taken were sent to the FSL. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the challan was presented. On framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Ferozepur praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 18.12.2023. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the FIR has been registered on the basis of the secret information and the recovery has been effected from the wall of baranda of the house. He submits that the house does not belong to the petitioner. He has submitted that secret information was received after sun set and thus, there is violation of mandatory provisions of Section 42 of the NDPS Act. He further submits that conscious possession of the alleged contraband from the petitioner is also not proved. Thus, he submits that there is a violation of mandatory provisions of Sections 42 and 50 of the NDPS Act. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since 23.09.2023, however, the prosecution has not been able to conclude the trial. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. He, thus, submits that the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was specifically named in the secret information and the house from which the



contraband has been recovered, the petitioner was found living there. He submits that the contraband recovered was found to be weighing 436.7 grams of Tramadol which is a commercial quantity and hence, provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted. It is submitted that out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, 04 witness have been examined so far and 04 witnesses have been given up. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is inferred that the petitioner has been arrested in the present case on the basis of the secret information received. The contraband has been recovered from the wall of the baranda of the house. The custody certificate would reflect that he has suffered incarceration of 01 year 06 months and 29 days as on 23.04.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Mohd Muslim @ Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 LiveLaw(SC)260***, this Court is of the opinion that the case of the petitioner is covered by the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In the abovesaid case Hon'ble Supreme Court expressed its views as under:-

19. A plain and literal interpretation of the conditions under Section 37 (i.e., that Court should be satisfied that the accused is not guilty and would not commit any offence) would effectively exclude grant of bail altogether, resulting in punitive detention and unsanctioned preventive detention as well. Therefore, the only manner in which such special conditions as enacted under Section 37 can be considered within constitutional parameters is where the court is reasonably satisfied on a prima facie look at



the material on record (whenever the bail application is made) that the accused is not guilty. Any other interpretation, would result in complete denial of the bail to a person accused of offences such as those enacted under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

20 xxxxx

21it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable.

22 xxxxx

23. There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, “as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal”²² (also see Donald Clemmer’s ‘The Prison Community’ published in 1940²³). Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials – especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up and concluded speedily.’

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is



CRM-M-52081-2024

ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

24.04.2025	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
sharmila	JUDGE
Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No