



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

120

CRM-M-65407-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.11.2025

SUKHWINDER SINGH ALIAS DULLA**...Petitioner**

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB**...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present:- Mr. Prabhpreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. The present petition is filed under Section 483 BNSS seeking interim release of the petitioner in FIR No. 0070/2025, registered under Sections 21, 27, and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Anti Narcotic Force, ANTF Wing, on the ground that the petitioner's mother is suffering from serious medical complications requiring hospitalization and eye surgery.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was falsely implicated and has no connection with the alleged offence. He was arrested on 15.03.2025 and has remained in custody since then. The challan has already been filed. He further submits that the petitioner's mother is undergoing medical complications which required hospitalization and eye surgery. Her operation was scheduled on 18.11.2025 and has already been performed. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, though the operation of the mother of the petitioner is performed, he still needs to take care of his mother. Being the sole earning



member of the family, he is the only person available to take care of his mother, to look after her and to manage her treatment. On these grounds, a prayer has been made for the grant of interim release.

3. Learned State counsel has opposed the bail request, submitting that the petitioner is involved in a serious offence under the NDPS Act and therefore should not be granted bail. He further submits that 305 grams of heroin was recovered from the petitioner's conscious possession, which falls under commercial quantity. He further submits that the petitioner's mother's eye surgery was scheduled for 18.11.2025 and has already been performed and further, the petitioner's wife is available to look after his mother, therefore, no ground is made out for granting interim release.

4. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and also perused the record.

5. Upon careful consideration of the submissions of both the parties and perusal of the record, it is not disputed that the mother of the petitioner has already undergone eye surgery. Except for the bald statement, there is no evidence to suggest that the petitioner's continued detention would materially affect the treatment or that there is any exigency requiring his presence. Hence, no justification survives for the grant of interim release.

6. Hence, in view of the factual matrix of the present case, the present petition, being devoid of any merits, is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

19.11.2025
Mohit Bishnoi

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