

251

CRM-M-11254-2026

-1-



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-11254-2026

Date of decision: 01.04.2026

CHINDERPAL SINGH @ CHHINDU @ SHINDERPAL SINGH
....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. PKS Phoolka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, DAG Punjab.

.....
RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.302 dated 22.12.2025 registered under Sections 21(B), 27, 29, 61, 85 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that as per the prosecution, on 22.12.2025, HC Sunder Singh along with his fellow police officials was on a patrolling duty and on the basis of suspicion apprehended the petitioner. On search, the petitioner was found in conscious possession of 06 grams of Heroin. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. He further contends that mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with at the time of alleged search and seizure. He argued



petitioner and nothing more is to be recovered from him. He further contends that the quantity of recovered contraband is non-commercial in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 22.12.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented, charges have been framed, out of 13 prosecution witnesses none has been examined. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars. It is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel who has appeared on advance notice has filed the custody certificate which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature and he was apprehended at the spot with the alleged contraband. He has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in multiple cases, meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months; investigation is complete; no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the



of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

8. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

01.04.2026

puneet

- i) Whether speaking/reasoned?
- ii) Whether reportable?

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No