

2026:PHHC:055224



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

231

CRM-M-17986-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision : 09.04.2026

Simranjit Singh @ Nikka Bath

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. H. S. Batth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant one is the second petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 47 dated 17.04.2024, registered under Sections 21, 27-A and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) and Section 201 of IPC at Police Station Sujanpur, District Pathankot. His previous petition was dismissed as withdrawn on 11.12.2025.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 17.04.2024, the petitioner and co-accused Gurjant Singh @ Ravi, while coming in an Innova car bearing registration number PB-09-V-2824 from the side of Jammu & Kashmir, were arrested by a police party and recovery of 15 grams of heroin and drug money of Rs. 5 Lakhs was effected

2026:PHHC:055224



from them. On search of the vehicle, recovery of 8.304 kgs. of heroin was effected from the same. During the course of investigation, both of them made disclosure statements that the aforesaid car was handed over to them by the co-accused Jagjit Singh on the asking of one Harpal Singh @ Bittu Bhalwan. It was also disclosed that the hidden compartment in the fuel tank of the vehicle was also made by co-accused Jagjit Singh and they used to hand over the heroin to him brought by them from Srinagar. On the basis of these disclosure statements, co-accused Jagjit Singh and Harpal Singh @ Bittu Bhalwan and along with several other persons were nominated as accused in this case. During further investigation, drug money of Rs. 8 Lakhs was recovered from co-accused Swaran Singh, Tousief Hussain and Ishfaq Mughal. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case and a false recovery has been planted upon him and co-accused. He has been in custody for a period of 01 year, 11 months and 18 days. There is prolonged pendency of the trial in the present case, and there is no likelihood of its conclusion in the near future, particularly as only 03 out of total 24 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Trial has also not progressed since the date of dismissal of his previous petition. The extended period of his incarceration is a sufficient and new ground to seek concession of bail to him. He is not involved in any similar case. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

2026:PHHC:055224



4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter, has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner. He has argued that taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, his criminal antecedents as well as the fact that commercial quantity of the contraband was recovered in this case, which attracts rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act, he does not deserve to be released on bail. Moreso, the instant petition, being a successive one, is not maintainable. The trial may be expedited. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or committing similar offences, if released on bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to be found in conscious possession of commercial quantity of contraband on 17.04.2024. He has been in custody since that very day and has spent a period of 01 year, 11 months and 08 days in custody. Obviously, the trial is likely to take time to conclude as a substantive number of the prosecution witnesses is yet to be examined. This factor, in the opinion of this Court, is a ground to move for bail afresh. The Hon'ble Apex Court has observed in a catena of cases that an accused cannot be kept in custody for an indefinite period of time, and the bail application can be considered on its own merits even if it is filed repeatedly. It has also been held that every day spent in custody can provide a new cause of action for filing a bail application under certain circumstances. This principle is a part of the broader approach emphasizing that law prefers bail over jail, aiming to balance

2026:PHHC:055224



the rights of the accused with the requirements of the criminal justice system. Prolonged detention itself is a ground for reconsideration of bail since the settled principle of law is that detention prior to trial should not become punitive. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail on account of delay in trial and long period of incarceration is to be considered in the light of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail on account of delay in trial and long period of incarceration is to be considered in the light of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the observations made by Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain v. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352***, wherein it was held that grant of bail on account of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, given the imperative of Section 436-A of Cr.P.C. which is applicable to offence under the Act. It was also observed that jails are overcrowded and their living conditions are, more often than not, appalling. The danger of unjustified imprisonment is that inmates are more likely to be hardened rather than reformed. Reliance can also be placed upon ***Manmandal and Another v. State of West Bengal, Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.8656 of 2023 decided on 14.09.2023 and Rabi Prakash v. State of Odisha, 2023 SCC Online SC 110***, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court had extended benefit of bail to the accused who had been incarcerated for a long period by observing that prolonged incarceration militated against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and in such a situation, the constitutional principles must override the statutory embargo contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

8. Reliance can also be placed upon ***Santosh Pawar Vs. State of***

2026:PHHC:055224



Chhattishgarh & Anr., Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025, which is a recently pronounced verdict of Hon'ble Supreme Court observing that rigours of Section 37 of NDPS Act will not be a bar for considering the case of an accused for bail as it comes with a condition that the prosecution would press for an early completion of trial. In the above-mentioned case the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that appellant who was being prosecuted for being in possession of commercial quantity of narcotic substance, was entitled for bail in view of her incarceration for a period of 19 months.

9. Similarly in another case i.e. in the case of ***Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation, (2022) 10 SCC 51*** prolonged incarceration and inordinate delay engaged the attention of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which considered the correct approach towards bail, with respect to several enactments, including Section 37 NDPS Act. The court expressed the opinion that Section 436A (which requires inter alia the accused to be enlarged on bail if the trial is not concluded within specified periods) of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 would apply.

10. In the case of ***Ismail Khan @ Pathan vs. State of Rajasthan Criminal Appeal No.4911 of 2025*** with regard to recovery of commercial quantity of narcotic substance, the Hon'ble Supreme Court accorded the benefit of bail to the accused in view of prolonged incarceration for a period of 02 years and 08 months of the accused.

11. The similar benefit has been extended in another appeal i.e. ***SLP No.15699-2025 titled as Ebrahim @ Ibrahim SK vs. The State of West Bengal*** and in the case of ***Pamesh Arora vs. UT Chandigarh Criminal Appeal No.4872 of 2025***.

2026:PHHC:055224



12. So far as the question of maintainability of the petition is concerned, it may be mentioned that an accused has a right to make successive applications for grant of bail, and it is the duty of the Court, while entertaining such a subsequent bail application, to consider the reasons and grounds on which the earlier bail petition was rejected. The fresh grounds which persuade the Court to take a view different from the one taken in the earlier application are also required to be recorded. Reference in this regard can be made to ***Prasad Shrikant Purohit v. State of Maharashtra (2018) 11 SCC 458***, wherein it was so observed.

13. On analyzing the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case in the light of the aforementioned principles of law, it transpires that the petitioner has suffered prolonged incarceration, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as most of the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined; he is not involved in any other case of similar nature, the continued detention of the petitioner is not likely to serve any fruitful purpose; there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate in the trial or will abscond or commit similar offences.

14. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that a case is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, and subject to the condition that he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case. He shall appear before the learned trial Court on each and every date of hearing except when his presence is exempted by the trial Court.

2026:PHHC:055224



15. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

09.04.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No