



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

215

CRM-M-51015-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 11.12.2025

Kuldeep Singh @ Kara @ Bauna ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.143 dated 07.07.2025 registered under Sections 21(b) of NDPS Act (Section 27 of NDPS Act was added later on) at Police Station Nehianwala, District Bathinda, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as he has not committed any alleged crime. No incriminating material has been recovered from his conscious possession at the time of arrest, and alleged recovery has been planted upon him. The peititoner was not even present at the time and place of alleged recovery of contraband. He is 70 years of age. He is in custody since the date of his arrest i.e. 07.07.2025. Learned counsel places reliance upon order dated 14.10.2024 passed by this Court in CRM-M-



50088-2024, in which anticipatory bail of the accused has been allowed. The trial will take sufficient time to conclude as only 1 PW out of total 12 PWs has been examined. Thus, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

3. Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner, which shows that the petitioner is behind bars since last about 05 months and 01 day and he is involved in multiple cases. He is a habitual offender. The same is taken on record. Learned State counsel contended that 30 grams of *heroin* has been recovered from the petitioner without any licence or permit, however, the said contraband falls under non-commercial quantity; charges have been framed and 1 PW out of total 12 PWs has been examined till date and if the petitioner is released on bail at this crucial stage, he will not be available for trial and chances to flee away from the process of law or delay the proceedings.

4. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paper book.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; particularly in view of the fact that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in 17 more cases, out of which 14 cases are of similar nature; 30 grams of *heroin* has been recovered from the petitioner; charges have been framed and trial is proceeding as case is fixed for prosecution evidence; and the contention of learned State counsel that if the petitioner is released on bail his presence cannot be secured during trial and chances to flee away from process of law, this Court finds no merit in the present petition, hence, the



CRM-M-51015-2025 (O&M) (3)

same is dismissed. However, the trial Court is directed to make efforts to conclude the trial expeditiously.

6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

11.12.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No