

2025:PHHC:160341



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

264

**CRM-M No.63745 of 2025
Date of Decision: 18.11.2025**

Gagandeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, 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.132 dated 18.09.2019 registered under Sections 22 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') at Police Station Khuian Sarwar, District Fazilka, on the allegations that on 18.09.2019, the co-accused Sandeep Singh was found to be in conscious possession of 2000 tablets average weight 409.82 mg of Tramadol Hydrochloride. He was arrested and suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which the present petitioner was nominated as an accused. The petitioner was arrested and vide order dated 25.08.2020,

2025:PHHC:160341



passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court, had been extended benefit of bail. He absented himself on 25.08.2025 due to which his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. He surrendered on 22.09.2025 and is in custody since then.

2. The petitioner had filed an application for regular bail which has been dismissed by the trial Court vide order dated 17.10.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that his absence on 25.08.2025 was not intentional but due to the fact that he had gone out of station. He could not contact the counsel engaged by him before the trial Court due to weak network connection of his cell phone who could not move application seeking exemption from appearance and due to this reason, his bail was cancelled. He himself had surrendered on 22.09.2025. He is now in custody since 22.09.2025. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab has advance notice of the petition and has submitted that since the petitioner is accused of a serious crime, therefore, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner had previously been extended benefit of bail. Only on one effective date of hearing, he could not appear before the learned trial Court. Now he is in custody since 22.09.2025. The trial is likely to take considerable time. Continued detention of the petitioner would not serve any

2025:PHHC:160341



useful purpose. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

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

18.11.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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