

2025:PHHC:175215



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

252

**CRM-M No.57447 of 2025
Date of Decision: 15.12.2025**

Deepak Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Aajeshwer Singh Grewal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant one is the third petition as filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.233 dated 24.12.2023 registered under Sections 22(c), 27 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') at Police Station City Rampura, District Bathinda. The first petition as filed by the petitioner bearing CRM-M-47373-2024 has been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 12.11.2024. The second petition as filed by the petitioner bearing CRM-M-17316-2025 has been dismissed vide order dated 26.05.2025.

2025:PHHC:175215



2. As per the allegations, on 24.12.2023, the accused Satnam Singh and Gurpreet Singh were apprehended along with their motorbike and 7600 tablets of Tramadol Hydrochloride wherein 1565.6 grams, 3600 tablets of Alprazolam having weight of 370.8 grams were recovered from their conscious possession which were taken into custody. The above named accused were formally arrested. They suffered disclosure statements to the effect that they had purchased the contraband from the petitioner who was nominated as such. The petitioner was arrested on 04.03.2024. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. No recovery has been effected from him. The trial will take time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He is on bail in another case registered against him. On the ground of prolonged incarceration, he deserves to be extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that there is no material change in the circumstances ever since the dismissal of the previous petition of the petitioner on 26.05.2025. It is a successive bail application on same grounds and hence, is not maintainable. The trial is going on at a proper pace. The petitioner has criminal antecedents. It is, therefore, urged that he

2025:PHHC:175215



does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have supplied commercial quantity of intoxicating tablets to the co-accused. His first petition has been dismissed as withdrawn and second petition was dismissed on merits on 26.05.2025. Now eight prosecution witnesses have been examined. Eleven have been given up as unnecessary witnesses as informed by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab and only a few witnesses remain to be examined meaning thereby trial is going at a proper pace and as such, it cannot be stated that there would be any prolonged delay in conclusion of the trial. There is no material or substantive change in the circumstances. Merely on the basis of prolonged custody, the petitioner cannot seek concession of bail as a matter of right. In view of the above facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15.12.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No