

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****229****CRM-M-15931-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision : 22.04.2026**

Karaj Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Anshuman Chopra, Advocate,
Mr. Deepesh Kakkar, Advocate and
Mr. Kush Kakkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.(Oral)

This petition is the third petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita', 2023. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.92 dated 06.06.2023, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 21, 25,27-A and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar, Punjab.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'ASI Balraj Singh' who had reported that on 06.06.2023, when he was leading a team of police officials, deputed for patrolling duty, on the basis of suspicious conduct a person who was travelling in a Fortuner car was



intercepted and on checking he was found in possession of 257 grams of Heroin and Rs.3,45,000/- drug money.

3. **Notice of motion.**

4. Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State Counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of two years and more than ten months, and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, as the co-accused is supposed to lead some defence evidence. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of above, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

7. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, in the present case there is no delay in trial as the entire prosecution evidence has already been recorded by the learned trial Court and the case is fixed for defence evidence. The learned State Counsel has also contended that otherwise also the conclusion of trial is not likely to take a long time and rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act are attracted in the present case, because



the recovered contraband comes within the ambit of commercial quantity. The learned State Counsel has further contended that this is the third petition for bail and from the date of dismissal of second bail petition, no significant change in material circumstances has taken place.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i) that the recovered contraband comes within the ambit of commercial quantity, and the rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act do not stand complied with in this case;
- ii) that there is no delay in trial as the entire prosecution evidence has already been recorded, and the case is fixed for defence evidence;
- iii) that the trial is likely to be concluded in near future; and
- iv) that from the date of dismissal of second bail petition, there is no significant change in circumstance which may make the petitioner eligible for filing the third petition for bail.

10. Taking into consideration the cumulative facts of all the abovementioned factors, it is hereby observed that the present petition is devoid of merit and deserved dismissal. Hence, the present petition is hereby *dismissed*. However, in view of facts and circumstances of the case, the



learned trial Court is directed to conclude the trial and pass the final verdict within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

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

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

22.04.2026
Vinod

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