



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M No.65853 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 28.11.2025

Paramjit Singh @ Adhar Card

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 21, 27(a), 29, 61, 85 of Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, the FIR No.221 dated 10.09.2025, has been lodged in Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar (Rural). The petitioner has been arrested in the above mentioned case as an accused. Since the petitioner is in custody, he has filed the present petition for the benefit of bail. This is first petition for bail under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the report of Sub Inspector 'Naresh Kumar'. It was reported by the above named police officer that on 10.09.2025 when he was heading a police party deputed for patrolling duty, on the basis of suspicion a person was intercepted near 'Dera Radha Suwami'. According to above named police officer on enquiry he disclosed his name as 'Paramjit Singh @ Aadhaar Card' and that on search of his person from his possession 9



grams of 'Heroin' was recovered.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above mentioned recovery of contraband the requisite formalities with regard to seizure and sealing of contraband, lodging of FIR and arrest of accused were performed and further investigation taken-up.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Since advance notice has already been served, Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of respondent-State, and waives service.

6. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State counsel has orally opted to oppose the present petition.

7. Heard. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of the record shows that there are several factors which are required to be taken into consideration at this stage. They are:-

- i) that quantity of contraband recovered from the possession of petitioner is non-commercial quantity, i.e. 9 grams of 'Heroin' which is just above the upper threshold meant for small quantity and only a fraction of lower limit fixed for commercial quantity;
- ii) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 2 ½ months;
- iii) that nothing is left to be recovered from possession of petitioner;
- iv) that the trial of the case is not likely to be concluded in near



future;

- v) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- vi) that detention of the petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence, or influence the witnesses;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if petitioner is released on bail, he will not participate/co-operate in the trial.

9. In the present case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***", 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, are also relevant, wherein it has been observed that "*a fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society. There is no doubt*



that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case”.

10. The principles laid down by the Hon’ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘**Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another**’, 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 577, are also relevant in this case. In the abovementioned case, it has been observed that “*the rate of conviction in criminal cases in India is abysmally low. It appears to us that this factor weighs on the mind of the Court while deciding the bail applications in a negative sense. Courts tend to think that the possibility of a conviction being nearer to rarity, bail applications will have to be decided strictly, contrary to legal principles. We cannot mix up consideration of a bail application, which is not punitive in nature with that of a possible adjudication by way of trial. On the contrary, an ultimate acquittal with continued custody would be a case of grave injustice*”.

11. Recently, in the case of ‘**Tapas Kumar Palit Vs. State of Chhattisgarh**’, 2022 INSC 222, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has observed that “*if an accused is to get a final verdict after incarceration of six to seven years in jail as an undertrial prisoner, then, definitely, it could be said that his right to have a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution has been infringed*”. It has also been observed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in



the abovementioned case that “*delays are bad for the accused and extremely bad for the victims, for Indian society and for the credibility of our justice system, which is valued. Judges are the masters of their Courtrooms and the Criminal Procedure Code provides many tools for the Judges to use in order to ensure that cases proceed efficiently*”.

12. Therefore, to elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to the accused as mandated by Hon’ble Apex court in “*Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and Another*”, *SLP (Crl.) No.8523/2024*.

13. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for the concession of bail and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

14. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby **allowed**. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court, subject to the following conditions:-

- i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him from closing such facts to the Court or to any other authority;
- ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change



in address to the trial Court, till the final decision of the trial;
and

iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission
of the trial Court.

15. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned
above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him
shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an
application in this regard.

16. It is, however, made clear that in case in FSL report the substance
recovered from the petitioner is found to be other than ‘Heroin’ which may
amount to commercial quantity the benefit of bail accorded to the petitioner
shall stands withdrawn automatically.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

28.11.2025
Manoj Bhutani

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