



256

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51377-2025
Decided on : 10.11.2025

Ranjodh Singh @ Jodha

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ranjodh Singh @ Jodha	35	01.05.2025	22(B) of NDPS Act, 1985	Bajakhana	Faridkot

2. As per the prosecution allegations, the petitioner – Ranjodh Singh @ Jodha, was apprehended on suspicion, and after following the due procedure in law, his search was conducted. From the black-coloured plastic bag carried by him, 40 strips of narcotic tablets (total 400 pills) were allegedly recovered, bearing the marking “NRX Tramadol Hydrochloride Tablets USP 100 mg, Tramawow-100, B.No.T241204, MFG. AUG 2024, Exp. JUL 2026”, along with a sum of ₹500/-.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and nothing incriminating has been recovered from him. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 01.05.2025, i.e., for the last about 06 months and 09 days, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Therefore, keeping the petitioner incarcerated any further would serve no fruitful purpose. Accordingly, learned counsel prays for the grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 09.11.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at the appropriate place. A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. It is further submitted that the petitioner is involved in three other criminal cases — two under the NDPS Act and one under other penal provisions. In support of his contention, reliance has been placed on paragraph No.7 of the status report, which reads as under:-

“7. **Criminal Antecedents:**
That as per the information received from the Police Station, except FIR No. 35 (supra), following other FIRs have stood registered against petitioner:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Under Section	Status
1.	90/08-09-2013	18 NDPS Act, P.S. Nihal Singh Wala	Convicted
2.	138/02-09-2023	21 NDPS Act, P.S.	Under trial



		<i>Dayalpura</i>	
<i>3.</i>	<i>34/24-05-2024</i>	<i>379-B/323/506/34 IPC, P.S. Dayalpura</i>	<i>Under trial</i>

”

Thus, it is contended that the petitioner is a habitual offender and not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail.”

6. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in one of the cases under the NDPS Act, the petitioner was convicted only for a non-commercial quantity and sentenced to the period already undergone, whereas in the remaining two cases, the trials are still pending. He further contends that the alleged recovery in the present case contains the salt Tramadol, weighing only 110 grams, which is significantly below the threshold of 250 grams prescribed for “commercial quantity.” Hence, the case falls within the ambit of non-commercial quantity under the NDPS Act.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

8. While considering the plea for bail, this Court is conscious of the nature of allegations and the recovery of narcotic contraband attributed to the petitioner. However, it also cannot be overlooked that the petitioner is a young individual who has already suffered incarceration for more than six months, the quantity recovered falls well within the non-commercial range, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Prolonged pre-trial detention would serve no meaningful purpose and may instead expose the petitioner to hardened criminals.

In view of the totality of the circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the petitioner’s plea for regular bail.



9. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.
Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

12. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

13. Petition stands **disposed of**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 10, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No