

CRM-M-50010-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50010-2025
Reserved on: 01.10.2025
Pronounced on: 29.10.2025

Lovepreet Singh @ Lovely ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Iqbalpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
27	19.04.2023	Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran	379-B IPC, 25 of Arms Act (Sections 379, 411, 34 IPC, 27 of Arms Act and 21-C, 29 of NDPS Act added later on)

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 16 of the bail petitioner and the custody certificate, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	51	13.04.2022	307, 326, 323, 341, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC	Sarhali
2	64	22.04.2023	379-B(2)/34 IPC	Sarhali

3. The facts and allegations are taken from para 3 and 4 of the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“3. That the brief facts pertaining to the present case are that on 19.04.2023, the complainant namely Naveen Chandol son of Kishori Chandol son of Amar Singh resident of Village Mallayawar, PS Ghumawari, District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh came before the Investigating Officer and got recorded his statement to the effect that "He (the complainant) resides at the

CRM-M-50010-2025

aforementioned address and is pursuing B.E. through correspondence. He (the complainant) is employed at Capgemini Technology Services, Noida, Uttar Pradesh. That on 19.04.2023, while driving his grey Ford Figo (petrol) bearing registration number DL-2C-AQ-2936, he traveled alone to Sri Darbar Sahib, Tarn Taran and Chohla Sahib Gurdwara. Thereafter, he (the complainant) stopped at the Indian Oil Petrol Pump in Mohanpura to refuel his car and parked on the roadside to smoke. At approximately 4:30 PM, three young men on a Splendor motorcycle, with their faces covered with cloth, approached him, brandished a pistol, and forcibly took his car keys and approximately ₹1,000 in cash before fleeing". In pursuance of the complainant's statement, the present case FIR No. 27 dated 19.04.2023, was registered under Section 379-B of IPC & 25, 27 of Arms Act, at Police Station Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran against the unknown persons.

4. That the deponent submits that on 22.04.2023, on the basis of secret information made before the Investigating Officer, the petitioner namely Lovepreet Singh @ Lovely along with the co-accused Pawandeep Singh have been nominated in the present case. During the course of interrogation of the petitioner on 23.04.2024, the petitioner Lovepreet Singh @ Lovely voluntarily suffered his Disclosure Statement in the presence of Shri. Arun Sharma, Deputy Superintendent of Police to the effect that "He (the petitioner), along with Pawandeep Singh @ Pawan (son of Raghubir Singh, resident of Dargapur, PS Sirhali), has been involved in the smuggling of heroin. The petitioner further disclosed that they had procured 300 grams of heroin, which was stored in a room of his house. Additionally, the petitioner revealed that a Hero motorcycle without registration number was parked in his house, which he had snatched along with Rishav and Jashan, residents of Thattian Mahantan, from a bridge near the drain in village Naushehra. The petitioner further stated that a white motorcycle was parked in his house, the details of which were known only to him, and that he could facilitate its recovery."

It is pertinent to mention here that one car make Ford Figo bearing registration No.DL-2C-AQ-2936 color grey, two motorcycle, on pistol 32 bore along with 03 live rounds and 300 grams of Heroin has also been recovered in the present case on 23.04.2023.

Furthermore, the petitioner admitted before the Investigating Officer that the pistol recovered from him had been purchased from Lovepreet Singh @ Lovejit Singh, son of Dilbag Singh, a resident of Village Gandiwind, PS Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran, for a consideration of ₹15,000/-. On the basis of which, Lovepreet Singh @ Lovejit Singh has been nominated as an

accused in the present case.”

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, 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 8 of the reply, the contraband is 300 grams of heroin.
8. Dealing in 300 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	300 Gram
Punishable U/s	S.21(c) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Commercial
Drug Quantity in % to upper limit of Intermediate	120.00%

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)

<i>Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985</i>		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1055(E)	10/19/2001
-		
Sr. No.	56	

CRM-M-50010-2025

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. The quantity allegedly involved in this case is commercial. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case. The petitioner must satisfy the twin

CRM-M-50010-2025

conditions set forth by the Legislature under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

10. Per the custody certificate dated 30.09.2025, the petitioner's custody in this FIR is of 02 years, 05 months & 05 days.

11. 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.

12. The petitioner is entitled to bail because, in somewhat similar cases where the quantity involved was either greater than or close to the amount seized in the current FIR, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has granted bail after prolonged custody, as demonstrated by the following judicial precedent.

13. In *Sabat Mehtab Khan v. The State of Maharashtra*, decided on 03 Sep 2024, SLP (Crl) 8557-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

The petitioner is an accused for the offences punishable under Sections 21(c) and 29 of the of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act and allegation is that 275 gms. and 50.01 gms of heroine has been recovered from him. His regular bail application was dismissed by the High Court. He has already undergone about 1 year six months in jail.

Heard learned senior counsel/counsel for the parties.

Considering the quantity of the contraband articles and the period of his incarceration, we are of the opinion that a case of bail is made out for the petitioner.

14. Following the judicial precedent mentioned above, 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. However, this order shall take effect from the time it is uploaded to this Court's official webpage.

CONDITIONS:

15. 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.

16. 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

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

CRM-M-50010-2025

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 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.

17. 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)

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

19. 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.

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

21. 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

CRM-M-50010-2025

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

22. 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."

23. 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.

24. 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.

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

26. 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.

27. 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."

CRM-M-50010-2025

28. Petition allowed in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

29.10.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.