



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

209

CRM-M-2728-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 13.02.2026

Manjeet Singh @Neela

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Ripudaman Singh, Advocate for
Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This is first petition for bail filed by the petitioner with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.60 dated 10.05.2024 under Section 22(c) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, hereinafter being referred to as 'NDPS Act' only, Police Station Kot Bhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib. The abovementioned FIR came into being when a police party headed by 'SI Satnam Singh', who was leading a team of police officials deputed for patrolling duty at Village Doda Buttar Shari-Dhulkot road, apprehended two persons on the basis of suspicion, and from the possession of one person, namely Manjeet Singh @Neela (petitioner herein), 290 strips containing 4350 tablets of Alprazolam were recovered.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to abovementioned recovery of contraband, requisite formalities with regard to



seizure and sealing of contraband, lodging of FIR and arrest of accused were undertaken and further investigation taken up.

3. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that he has already suffered prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of almost one year and nine months. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and therefore, his detention in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose. While claiming that the right to speedy trial has been breached in the present case, and the right to personal life and liberty is being violated, the learned counsel for the petitioner has craved for relaxing the conditions enshrined under Section-37 of NDPS Act.

6. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. The learned State Counsel has contended that in the present case, the recovery of contraband from the possession of petitioner comes within the ambit of 'commercial quantity', and therefore, unless the twin conditions enshrined under Section-37 of NDPS Act are satisfied, the benefit of bail should not be accorded to the petitioner.



7. The record has been perused carefully.
8. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, out of 18, 11 prosecution witnesses have already been given up by the prosecution and the statements of five prosecution witnesses have been recorded. The record also reveals that the cross-examination of two prosecution witnesses has been deferred on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner only, which shows that delay in trial cannot be attributed to the prosecution. Rather it has to be attributed to the defence only. Otherwise also, it is relevant to note here that once the trial is at fag end, the plea of denial of right to speedy trial is not sustainable.
9. A perusal of record further shows that in the present case, the contraband recovered from the possession of petitioner comes within the ambit of 'commercial quantity', and therefore, without satisfying the twin conditions, enshrined under Section-37 of NDPS Act, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail. The factual matrix of the instant case and the pleas taken by the petitioner nowhere shows that the abovementioned conditions stand satisfied in this case.
10. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case is taken into consideration it leads to the conclusion that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail. Thus, it is hereby held that being devoid of merit the present petition deserves dismissal. The same is hereby *dismissed*, accordingly.



11. However, keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of about one year and nine months, and that the trial is at fag end, the learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial in this case, and endeavour to decide the same within next three months, from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

13.02.2026

Gaurav Thakur

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