



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

207

CRM-M-53540-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 31.10.2025

Ishu ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Malkiat S. Hunda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.177, dated 19.06.2025, registered under Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 wherein offence under Sections 21, 27-A and 29 of NDPS were added later on, at Police Station Islamabad, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he was nominated on the basis of disclosure statements made by co-accused, Dhruv and Aman as a supplier of 'heroin', however, nothing has been recovered from his possession. It is alleged that an amount of Rs.10,000/- was recovered from him, which is stated to be drug money; the petitioner has been in custody for the last more than 3 months; investigation qua him has already



been completed; trial will take sufficient time to conclude; and the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

3. Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner, which shows that the petitioner is behind bars since the last about 3 months and 1 day. Custody certificate is taken on record. He has opposed the bail petition of the petitioner on the ground that he is supplier of the contraband, which was recovered from co-accused and he is also involved in two other cases of similar nature.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; since, the present petitioner was nominated on the basis of disclosure statement; no contraband has been recovered from his possession; it is alleged that amount of Rs.10,000/- was recovered from his possession, which is stated to be drug money; the petitioner has been in custody for the last 3 months; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, 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.

CRM-M-53540-2025 (O&M)

(3)

7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

31.10.2025

Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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