

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

237

CRM-M-52891-2025
Date of decision: 01.12.2025

GURPARTAP SINGH

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent


CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Raman Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Rajeev K. Kapila, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, A AG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case having FIR No.72 dated 18.08.2023 registered under Sections 22/29/61/85 of NDPS Act at Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur.
2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 18.08.2023, ASI Vijay Kumar along with other police officials was present at Canal Bridge Panjora, when they saw three persons coming on a motorcycle bearing No. PB-10-CR-7988. ASI Vijay Kumar signaled the motorcyclist to stop but upon seeing the police party, the driver tried to turn back but they were apprehended. On asking, driver of motorcycle disclosed his name as Amritpal Singh and the pillion riders disclosed their names as Ranjit Singh and Gurpartap Singh (petitioner). After completing necessary formalities, personal search of accused was conducted. Upon search, 100 Proxyvon capsules were recovered from Amritpal Singh, 15 unlabelled intoxicant injections were recovered from Ranjit Singh and 315 grams of intoxicant powder (Tramadol




Hydrochloride) was recovered from Gurpartap Singh (petitioner). Petitioner along with co-accused was arrested on 18.08.2023. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented against the accused for trial.

3. Upon notice, the State counsel has appeared and has opposed the bail. Both the parties have been heard and material placed on the file has been perused.


4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. Learned counsel next contended that the petitioner is in custody since 18.08.2023 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented. Thereafter, charge has been framed on 01.03.2024. Trial will take a long time to conclude and in view of his long incarceration, petitioner is entitled to be released on bail. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgments passed in CRM-M-21794 of 2023 – **Sandeep Singh v. State of Punjab** decided on 05.05.2023, CRR-1785 of 2018 (O&M)- **Vicky Kaur v. State of Punjab**, decided on 13.08.2018, CRM-M-14029 of 2018 **Kamlesh v. State of Punjab**, decided on 06.05.2015, CRM-M-17321 of 2025 **Jassu Ram @ Jasuram v. State of Punjab**, decided on 04.04.2025 and a judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. (s).12788/2023 – **Nandalal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal v. The State of West Bengal**, judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025 - **Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Anr.** decided on 14.11.2025 and (2022) 10 SCC 52, **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation** decided on 11.07.2022.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous crime as he was found in possession of commercial quantity of Tramadol Hydrochloride and in view of rigors



contained in statutory provision of Section 37 of NDPS Act, she is not entitled to the benefit of bail.


6. As per prosecution case, petitioner was found in possession of 315 grams of intoxicant powder (Tramadol Hydrochloride). He is in custody since 18.08.2023 and as such, trial has been delayed and there is no likelihood of the same being concluded soon. Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2023 Live Law (SC) 533, **Rabi Prakash v. State of Odisha** has held that 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 of the NDPS Act. To the same effect is the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2024 (4) RCR (Criminal) 172, **Ankur Chaudhary v. State of Madhya Pradesh** 2023 AIR(SC) 1648, **Mohammad Muslim alias Hussain v. State (NCT of Delhi)** in which Hon'ble Supreme Court while granting regular bail to an accused, from whom commercial quantity of contraband was recovered, has held that grant of bail on the ground of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. A co-ordinate Bench of this Court has also held so in judgment reported as **Law Finder Doc Id #2770222 Garpawandeep Singh alias Bihari v. State of Punjab** decided vide judgment dated 27.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-19408 of 2025 wherein 260 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered. Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) No.12788/2023 titled **Nandalal Mondal alias Abhay Mondal v. The State of West Bengal**, vide judgment dated 03.01.2024 while taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner/under- trial, the fact that he does not have any criminal antecedents and also keeping in view the prolonged incarceration, ordered release of the petitioner on bail who was found



in possession of 10,000 ml of codeine phosphate - a cough syrup which falls within the commercial quantity. Hon'ble Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025 titled **Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Anr. (Supra)**, has held that appellant who was being prosecuted for being in possession of commercial quantity of narcotic substance was entitled for bail in view of her incarceration for a period of 19 months. In **Satender Kumar Antil's case (supra)**, prolonged incarceration and inordinate delay engaged the attention of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, which considered the correct approach towards bail, with respect to several enactments, including Section 37 of NDPS Act. The Court expressed the opinion that Section 436A of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (which requires inter alia the accused to be enlarged on bail if the trial is not concluded within specified periods) would apply.

7. Therefore, taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the present case and also the ratio of law laid down in afore-mentioned case laws, I am of the opinion that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody and resultantly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions. However, in addition to the terms and conditions that may be imposed by the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) Petitioner shall not misuse the concession of bail granted to him.
- (ii) Petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary during the trial.
- (iii) Petitioner shall regularly appear before the trial Court and he will not commit any offence of similar nature while on bail.



- (iv) Petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (v) Petitioner shall not in any manner delay the trial.

In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions or the conditions that may be imposed by the trial Court or upon any other sufficient cause, the State shall be at liberty to apply for cancellation of bail.

01.12.2025
Priyanka Thakur

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No