

2025:PHHC:171618



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

237

**CRM-M No.55532 of 2025
Date of Decision: 08.12.2025**

Shinderpal @ Shinderpal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking indulgence of this Court by filing the present petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.321 dated 16.10.2023 registered under Section 21 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short ‘NDPS Act’) at Police Station Special Task Force, Phase 4 Mohali, District SAS Nagar Mohali, on the allegations that on 16.10.2023, he along with the co-accused Raj Kumar @ Karan was apprehended on the basis of a secret information and recovery of 1 kg of heroin was effected from their conscious possession.

2025:PHHC:171618



2. The previous two petitions as filed by the petitioner bearing CRM-M No.32927 of 2024 and CRM-M No.52112 of 2024 had been dismissed by this Court on 31.07.2024 and 06.02.2025 respectively. The petitioner filed a Special Leave Petition before Hon'ble Supreme Court which too had been dismissed vide order dated 15.05.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the trial has not been concluded so far despite the fact that a period of more than 10 months has passed from the date of dismissal of his second petition. It is argued that the prolonged period of his incarceration is a new and substantive circumstance granting right to him to seek concession of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that the trial now stands concluded. The case is at the stage of producing defence evidence. The petitions filed by the petitioner before this Court had been dismissed on merits. Even the Special Leave Petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed. As such, no ground is made out for allowing the petition. Accordingly, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner was allegedly found to be in conscious possession of commercial quantity of contraband. His previous two petitions had been dismissed by this Court. Now the trial has concluded. As such, it



and that the petitioner would suffer from any prolonged incarceration. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

08.12.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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