



229

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

CRM-M-53405-2025

Date of decision : 11.12.2025

Lovepreet Singh @ Love

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Shefali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.63 dated 15.04.2024, under Sections 21-C and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Special Task Force (Mohali), District S.A.S. Nagar.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the Police party while on patrolling on 15.04.2024, received a secret information to the effect that a person named Love was involved in selling of Heroin. It was informed that even today he was waiting near GT Road in front of Gurdwara Sadh Sangat Kathania. In case the barricading is laid, he could be arrested along with contraband. On receiving the secret information, the raiding party reached at the place disclosed and a person was spotted as described in the secret information. On seeing the police party, he tried to fled away, however, he was apprehended by the police party. On asking, he disclosed his name to be Lovepreet Singh @ Love (present petitioner).

He was suspected to be carrying some contraband and thus, on giving the



offer, search was conducted. On conducting the search, 417 grams of heroin was recovered from the right pocket of his trouser. He failed to produce any license regarding possession of the same and hence, the FIR was registered and he was arrested on spot. The investigation commenced. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. On receipt of FSL report, challan presented and on framing of charges, trial commenced. The petitioner approached Learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 30.07.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-62988-2024, however, the same was dismissed as not pressed on 08.05.2025. Hence, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing of present second petition for grant of bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the present FIR has been registered on the basis of secret information. He submits that there is gross violation of provisions of Section 42 of NDPS Act. He submits that the alleged recovery was effected from the personal search of the petitioner, however, there is violation of mandatory provisions of Section 50 of NDPS Act. He submits that the alleged recovery has been effected from a public place, however, no independent witness was joined by the investigating agency. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He submits that false implication of the petitioner is evident as he is behind bars from last more than 1 ½ years and thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.



4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner was specifically named in the secret information. He submits that the recovery effected in the present case is 417 grams of heroin, which falls under the category of commercial quantity and thus, provisions of Section 37 of NDPS Act, are attracted in the present case. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses remains to be examined. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner on record.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the present FIR was registered on the basis of secret information. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest i.e. 15.04.2024. The alleged recovery in the present case has been effected from a public place. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 07 months and 22 days as on 10.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. As submitted before this Court, majority of the witnesses already stand examined and only 07 witnesses still remain to be examined.

6. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court cannot ignore the fact that the speedy trial is the fundamental right of every accused. 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

21.it 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 conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and



circumstances of the case, 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 ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11.12.2025

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

ps-I

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No