



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.5051 of 2026
Date of decision:-06.04.2026

PARMINDER SINGH ALIAS MEET

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU*

Present :- Mr. Harsh Neyol, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J.

1. This is the first regular bail application under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, for grant of regular bail in FIR No.47 dated 24.04.2025, registered under Section 22(c) of the NDPS Act at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda.
2. As per the case of the prosecution, a recovery of 80 vials containing codeine phosphate and triprolidine hydrochloride cough syrup, each vial containing 100 ml, along-with 80 strips of Carisoprodol tablets (each strip containing 10 tablets, totaling 800 tablets), was effected from the petitioner. As per the report of the FSL, the recovered contraband has been found to fall within the ambit of commercial quantity.
3. The petitioner has raised a serious doubt regarding the sanctity of the case property and the chain of custody. It is contended that as per the



statement of SI Jaswinder Singh, Incharge, Secret Cell, Bathinda, the case property was produced before him on 28.04.2025 vide Road Certificate No.100 dated 28.04.2025. However, the same officer claims that the case property had already been sealed with Secret Seal No.292/UBT dated 25.04.2025. This creates an inherent contradiction, as a seal bearing an earlier date could not have been affixed on property allegedly received later. It is thus argued that either the seal has been ante-dated or the version regarding the date of receipt is false. Further, no explanation has been furnished as to where the case property remained and in whose custody it was kept between 25.04.2025 and 28.04.2025. Such discrepancy, coupled with overwriting/cutting on the docket, breaks the chain of custody, thereby creating a serious doubt about the genuineness of the alleged recovery.

4. Vide order dated 04.02.2026, this Court observed that as per the statement of SI Jaswinder Singh, Incharge, Secret Cell, Bathinda, the case property was produced before him on 28.04.2025 vide Road Certificate No.100 dated 28.04.2025, whereas it is stated to have been sealed with Secret Seal No. 292/UBT dated 25.04.2025. This Court, *prima-facie*, noted the apparent discrepancy in the dates and observed that the secret seal appended appeared to be ante-dated, and accordingly sought an explanation from the State by way of a status report.

5. In response, the prosecution has attempted to clarify that initially, the sample parcel was sent to the Forensic Science Laboratory, Bathinda on 25.04.2025 after obtaining docket number 292/UBT dated 25.04.2025. However, the same was returned by the laboratory with certain



objections. Thereafter, after removal of objections, the case property was again sent and finally deposited in the laboratory on 28.04.2025 vide Road Certificate No.100 dated 28.04.2025, while retaining the same earlier docket number, i.e 292/UBT dated 25.04.2025. It is thus contended that there is no manipulation or ante-dating, and the discrepancy is only procedural due to re-submission of the sample.

6. I have considered the explanation furnished by the State in the status report with regard to the apparent discrepancy in the dates relating to the handling and deposit of the case property. Upon due consideration, this Court is of the view that, if the said explanation is taken at its face value, the discrepancy stands sufficiently explained and reconciled. The earlier date, i.e 25.04.2025, pertains to the initial movement of the sample and the allotment of docket number, whereas the subsequent date, i.e 28.04.2025, reflects the final deposit of the case property in the Forensic Science Laboratory after removal of the objections. Thus, as per the version put forth by the prosecution, the inconsistency in dates stands clarified.

7. It is, however, made clear that the above observation is only for the purpose of disposal of the present application and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case, and the accused shall be at liberty to raise all permissible objections during the course of trial.

8. Keeping in view the nature and quantity of contraband recovered from the petitioner, which falls within the ambit of commercial quantity, the rigours of the provisions of the NDPS Act are clearly attracted. In such circumstances, no ground is made out for grant of regular



bail to the petitioner.

- 9. Accordingly, the present regular bail application is dismissed.
- 10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

06.04.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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