



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

[206]

CRM-M-51979-2025

Date of decision : 19.09.2025

Manpreet Singh @ Nikka

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J.(ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as “BNSS”), seeking regular bail in FIR No. 79 dated 22.07.2025 for offences under Sections 21 (b), 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and Section 111 BNS, 2023 (Offences under Sections 29 of the NDPS Act and Section 111 of BNS, 2023 added later on), registered at Police Station Nakodar, District Jalandhar (Rural).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that as per the prosecution case, the alleged contraband has been recovered from the dashboard of the vehicle in which the present petitioner was travelling as a co-passenger and the vehicle was being driven by co-accused, namely, Sahil Kumar at that time. He further submitted that the alleged recovery of contraband falls under the category of non-commercial quantity and the petitioner is in custody since 22.07.2025 i.e. approximately two months. Investigation has already been completed in the matter and he is not required for any further investigation purpose. Learned counsel for the petitioner also contended that regarding the previous cases, nothing has been recovered from his possession and he was nominated in those case(s) on the basis of disclosure statement. In one case, he was sentenced only for seven days. He also submitted that the trial of the case is likely to take considerable time and no fruitful purpose will be served by keeping him behind the bars. The petitioner prays for concession of regular bail. The petitioner undertakes to abide by all conditions



imposed by the Court and assures that he will not tamper with evidence, influence witnesses, or abscond during trial.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel appearing on advance notice filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner as well as the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner, by submitting that the present petitioner is also involved in two other cases of similar nature and if he released on bail, he will certainly indulge in similar criminal activities. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and taking into consideration the fact that investigation in the matter has already been completed and the petitioner is not required for any investigation purpose, and also the fact that the alleged contraband was recovered from the dashboard of vehicle in which the petitioner was travelling as co-passenger and same falls under the category of non-commercial quantity; the trial would take sufficient long time to conclude; no fruitful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars any further, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

19.09.2025
Anjal

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No