

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

2025:PHHC:167911



(225)

CRM-M-66234-2025

Date of Decision: 02.12.2025

Pardeep Kumar @ Pappi

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

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

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL.J (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.28 dated 17.04.2025, under Sections 22 and 29 (added later on) of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Pojewal, District SBS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that 40 intoxicating tablets of Etizolam were recovered from the possession of co-accused Rajdeep Singh @ Deepa and the present petitioner has been implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement made by said Rajdeep Singh @ Deepa. It has also been submitted that main accused Rajdeep Singh @ Deepa has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 28.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-38914-

2025. It is further submitted that no recovery has been effected from the

present petitioner, although, he is stated to be involved in four more cases under the N.D.P.S Act, however, he is stated to be granted bail in all those cases. The petitioner has undergone custody period of more than 7 ½ months in the present case and apart from the disclosure statement made by co-accused, there is no other evidence against the petitioner. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time.

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner by submitting that he is a habitual offender and is involved in four more cases under the N.D.P.S Act, however, he has been granted bail in all those cases. He, upon instructions, submits that petitioner has undergone custody period of more than 7 ½ months in the present case.

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

5. In view of the aforesaid submissions of learned counsel(s) for the parties and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is in custody for more than 7 ½ months in the present case and the trial is likely to take a long time, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as his continuous detention would not serve the ends of justice.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

02.12.2025
lucky

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No