



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

204

CRM-M-71763-2025
Decided on : 24.12.2025

Satnam Singh @ Sajan . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Komalpreet Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Satnam Singh @ Sajan	57	09.05.2025	21(b), 27(a), 29/61/85 of NDPS Act, 1985	City Sultanwind	Amritsar

2. As per allegations levelled in FIR, 9.18 grams of heroin was recovered from a polythene envelope, which the petitioner was holding in his hand and he was in the process of throwing it away on seeing the police party.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that there is no other instance ever registered against the petitioner under the NDPS Act in past. Moreover, quantity recovered is marginal more than the small quantity, i.e., 5 grams.

Further argues that after completion of investigation, final report (challan) has already been submitted, however, process of recording of statements of the prosecution witnesses, is yet to start. Thus, conclusion of trial shall take considerable time. Besides, petitioner is inside jail for a period of about 07 months and 11 days and thus, cannot be detained inside jail for indefinite period in the absence of any progress in the trial, it is prayed that the



petitioner also deserves to be extended the same benefit of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 23.12.2025, in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that quantity recovered is almost double to the small quantity of heroin, as it is near to 10.00 grams. He also submits that such kind of offences are at rise in the State of Punjab and granting bail to the petitioner will send a wrong message to the youth of the State.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that trial is yet to start, though investigation has been completed. Besides, other factual assertions as noticed here-above have not been disputed by learned State counsel.

6. On being asked by the Court, learned State counsel also confirmed that petitioner was never found indulge in any other similar activity ever in past.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material on record, it is evident that recovery effected from the petitioner is marginal higher than the small quantity, i.e., 9.18 grams of heroin in the present case. Further, petitioner, who is aged about 30 years, has already undergone incarceration for more than seven months. The investigation stands concluded, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to reach its culmination. Considering his young age and other antecedents, this Court is inclined to extend him an opportunity to reform and rehabilitate himself in society rather than keeping him confined behind bars for an indefinite period during the trial.

In view of the totality of these circumstances, and the nature allegations leveled against the petitioner, including the factors noticed here-above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner, so as to afford the petitioner an opportunity to reform and reintegrate himself in the society.

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. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

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**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

December 24, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No