


242

CRM-M-13528-2026

-1-



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13528-2026

Date of decision: 17.03.2026

LOVEDEEP SINGH @ BALVEER @ BALBIRPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG Punjab.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0097 dated 25.06.2024 registered under Sections 22(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 29 of the NDPS Act added later on) at Police Station Jaito, District Faridkot.

2. Brief facts of the present case, as per the prosecution, are that on 25.06.2024, ASI Angrej Singh along with his fellow police officials apprehended the petitioner and one Ravi Singh who were on a motorcycle. A black bag was placed on the motorcycle between the petitioner and co-accused and on checking the same, 10200 intoxicating tablets of Tramadol were recovered. 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




were not complied with at the time of alleged search and seizure. He argued that the recovery of alleged contraband has already been effected from the petitioner and nothing more is to be recovered from him. The petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 25.06.2024. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented, charges have also been framed and out of 24 prosecution witnesses 09 witnesses have been given up. He submits that similarly placed co-accused Ravi Singh has already been granted concession of regular bail by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 18.02.2026 in *CRM-M-71143-2025*. 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 and therefore, 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 that he was apprehended at the spot with the alleged contraband, which falls under the commercial quantity. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is first time offender and is not involved in any other case.


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 01 years and 08 months, investigation is complete; challan stands presented, charges have also been framed and out of 24 prosecution witnesses 09 witnesses have been given up; similarly placed co-



Bench of this Court; 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 bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of her 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. A two-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Nandlal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.12788/2023***, granted bail to the accused after 18 months of incarceration on the ground of delay in trial in an NDPS matter involving commercial quantity of contraband. Similar relief has been granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a series of judgments, namely: *Md. Aliul Islam @ Aliul Islam @ Alius v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No. 736/2024*; *Debrata Mondal v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.14970/2023*; *Santarul Islam @ Santa v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.13169/2023*; *Indrajit Mondal @ Piglu v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.8512/2023*; *Narjul Islam @ Najbul Hoque v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.14172/2023*; *Subhashri Das @ Rana @ Subhoshree v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.15284/2023*; *Mithun Sk. & Anr. v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.16598/2023*; *Sk. Nasiruddin @ Nasirddin Sk. v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.) No.3402/2024*; *Indadul Shah v. State of West Bengal, SLP (Crl.)*



Seikh & Ors. v. State of West Bengal, SLP (CrI.) No.16663/2023; *Moidul Sarkar v. State of West Bengal*, SLP (CrI.) No.15668/2023; *Saniya Bibi @ Soniya Bibi v. State of West Bengal*, SLP (CrI.) No.2354/2024; *Saddam Hossain v. State of West Bengal*, SLP (CrI.) No.15496/2023; *Bijon Sk. @ Golam Murselim v. State of West Bengal*, SLP (CrI.) No.6046/2024; and *Subhas v. State of West Bengal*, SLP (CrI.) No.8823/2019.

9. Moreover, prolonged detention of the petitioner, without any likelihood of the trial being concluded in the near future, would amount to a violation of their fundamental rights guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, 2023 AIR SC 1648**, while dealing with an NDPS case, held that the principles of fairness embodied under Article 21 override the statutory restrictions on grant of bail under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Speaking through Justice S. Ravindra Bhat, the Court observed:

"20. The standard to be considered therefore, is one, where the court would look at the material in a broad manner, and reasonably see whether the accused's guilt may be proved. The judgments of this court have, therefore, emphasized that the satisfaction which courts are expected to record, i.e., that the accused may not be guilty, is only prima facie, based on a reasonable reading, which does not call for meticulous examination of the materials collected during investigation (as held in Union of India v. Rattan Malik). Grant of bail on ground of undue delay in trial, cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the Act, given the imperative of Section 436A which is applicable to offences under the NDPS Act too (ref. Satender Kumar Antil supra). Having regard to these factors the court is of the opinion that in the facts of this case, the appellant deserves to be enlarged on bail.



21. Before parting, it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable . Jails are overcrowded and their living conditions, more often than not, appalling."

10. 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.

17.03.2026
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |