

2025:PHHC:158067



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

209

CRM-M-63019-2025
Date of decision:14.11.2025

ASI GURPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Inderpal Singh Parmar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. 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. 0070 dated 03.05.2025, registered under Section(s) 21 (b), 59 (Section 29 added later on) of the NDPS Act, 1985 and Section 52 of the Prisons Act, 1894 at Police Station Cantt., Bathinda.

2. The case of the prosecution, is that the petitioner, an official of the IRB, reported for duty on 03.05.2025 in Block No. 4 (STF Block) of Central Jail, Bathinda. During routine checking at the entry gate, he was allegedly found in possession of 41 grams of Heroin, leading to the issuance of an intimation to the SHO, Police Station Cantt., Bathinda, on the basis of

which the present FIR was registered. Two days after his arrest, a disclosure statement of the petitioner was recorded, pursuant to which an additional recovery of 56 grams of Heroin was allegedly effected from his residence, bringing the total quantity to 97 grams. Counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody since 03.05.2025 and has already undergone more than 06 months of actual custody. The quantity in question is non-commercial and the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Moreover, the case is fixed for framing of charge, hence, the trial is yet to commence.

3. Counsel for the respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid facts. She, however, submits that having regard to the quantity of contraband recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, who is himself a police official, the act constitutes a grave breach of official duty and, therefore, the petitioner does not merit the concession of bail in the present case.

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

5. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration that the petitioner is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act, coupled with the period of custody already undergone, the recovery being of an intermediate quantity, and the clean antecedents of the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

6. 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.

7.

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.
8.

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 14, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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