

2025:PHHC:154326



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

208

**CRM-M-54808-2025
Date of decision: 10.11.2025**

CHAN SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 158 dated 26.07.2025, registered under Section(s) 22 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Mehatpur, District Jalandhar.

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that on 26.07.2025, while the police officials were on patrol duty near Baba Jandi Peer, Village Butte Dian Channa, they noticed a clean-shaven man approaching from the opposite direction. Upon seeing the police party, the man dropped a black polythene packet from his hand and attempted to flee. He was immediately apprehended

by the police, and upon inspection of the discarded packet, 15 intoxicant tablets were recovered, leading to the registration of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.07.2025 and that the FSL report is still awaited to ascertain the exact nature and quantity of the alleged contraband substance. It is further contended that the total weight of the recovered tablets has not been specified by the respondent-State in the FIR. Counsel also points out that the Additional Public Prosecutor, before the trial court, had submitted that the petitioner stands convicted in six other cases, five of which pertain to offences under the NDPS Act. However, a perusal of the custody certificate reveals a discrepancy, indicating that the petitioner is involved in only four cases. It is submitted that challan has yet to be filed and the trial is yet to commence.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that the petitioner was involved in another offences, however, he does not dispute that in none of the offences, any commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner has already undergone more than 03 months of actual custody and that the challan has yet to be filed.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances noticed above including the fact that the exact quantity of recovery is yet to be determined, the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of investigation and bearing in mind that the trial is yet to start, I deem it

appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

NOVEMBER 10, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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