



CRM-M-64624-2025 (O&M) 1

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

205

CRM-M-64624-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.11.2025

Karanveer Singh @ Bunty @ Panda

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG, Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.40 dated 21.03.2025, registered under Section 22 of NDPS Act (Section 27 of NDPS Act, 1985 added later on) at Police Station Anandpur Sahib, District Rupnagar.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for about 8 months. The alleged recovery from him is of contraband marginally above the commercial quantity, it being 11 vials which comes to 22 ml from the dicky of the Aactiva. It is thus debatable that he is in conscious possession of the contraband. There is non-compliance of mandatory provision of Sections 50 and 54 of NDPS Act. No independent witness was joined in the present case. Charges were framed on 11.08.2025, however, out of 14 prosecution witnesses, only 1 has been examined. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

3. The custody certificate dated 20.11.2025, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 7 months and 27 days.



CRM-M-64624-2025 (O&M) 2

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the recovery of alleged contraband falls in the ambit of commercial quantity. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to the stage of the case and the petitioner not being involved in other case.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 7 months and 27 days; not involved in any other case; charges have been framed on 11.08.2025, however, out of 14 prosecution witnesses, only 1 has been examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time; further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be diluted bearing in mind the right to a speedy trial, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.



- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

21.11.2025
dinesh

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