



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-66256-2025
Decided on : 19.12.2025

JASHANPREET SINGH ALIAS JEENU ALIAS JASHANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jashanpreet Singh @ Jeenu @ Jashandeep Singh, aged 19 years	65	22.03.2025	22(c) of NDPS Act	Lambi	Sri Muktsar Sahib

2. Reading the contents of the FIR, counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation of jointly throwing a black polythene bag by both the accused, i.e. petitioner and his co-accused Husandeep Singh



alias Hasan, appears highly improbable. Upon searching the bag, it was found to contain only 30 Etizolam tablets, with the total active salt weighing 5.970 grams.

It is further contended that both the accused persons were allegedly in a Honda City car, bearing registration No.DL-10-CH-1204. Had there been any truth in the allegations, it would have been far easier and more logical for the accused persons to dispose of the contraband while remaining in the vehicle they were already occupying, rather than throwing it away jointly.

3. Further submits that petitioner is a young boy, aged 19 years, with no previous involvement in any criminal activity. Petitioner is in custody for a period of approximately 8 months and 23 days. Out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined, till date. Therefore, conclusion of the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time.

4. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate and status report dated 17.12.2025 in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 08 months and 23 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against him.

5. Learned State counsel does not dispute any of the factual assertions made by counsel for the petitioner before this Court. However,



while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that the quantity of the active substance in the Etizolam recovered from the polythene bag is of commercial quantity, being more than double the non-commercial threshold of 2.5 grams. Thus, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

6. Taking into account the totality of circumstances, facts and allegations levelled against the petitioner, status report filed by learned State counsel, period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, and stage of the trial, wherein only one out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, has been examined, till date; and considering that the allegations are yet to be confirmed by the trial court on the basis of complete set of evidence, and more importantly, that petitioner is a first-time offender and a young boy of 19 years of age, it is necessary to afford the petitioner an opportunity for rehabilitation and reintegration into society. In the light of above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.



8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.
9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.
10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.
11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

19.12.2025
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO