



CRM-M-22437-2026

-1-

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

236

CRM-M-22437-2026  
Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

Saab Singh @ Sahab Singh @ Sabhi @ Paharu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present: Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amritpal Singh, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.51 dated 11.04.2025 registered under Sections 21-B and 27-A of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Sections 31 of the NDPS Act and Section 111 of BNS added later on), at Police Station Division 'A', District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that on 11.04.2025, ASI Madhu Bala, along with his fellow police officials was on patrolling duty and on suspicion, apprehended the petitioner, who was found in conscious possession of 21 grams of heroin along with cash amount of Rs.600/-. Hence, the present FIR.

**CRM-M-22437-2026****-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. He further submitted that mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with at the time of alleged search and seizure. He argued that small amount of Rs.600/- cannot be termed as drug money. He argued that recovery of alleged contraband has already been effected from the petitioner and nothing more is to be recovered from him. He further argued that alleged recovery of contraband falls under the non-commercial quantity. The petitioner is in custody since 11.04.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submitted that there are total 22 prosecution witnesses but none has been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and status report in the matter, which are taken on record and while referring to status report, he has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner 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.

5. 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



CRM-M-22437-2026

-3-

for the last more than 01 year and 01 month; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges framed; out of 22 witnesses, none has been examined till date; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial, which is proceeding at snail's pace and the same will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. 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 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*".

7. 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*



CRM-M-22437-2026

-4-

*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."*

8. 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.

**(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**14.05.2026**  
*D.Bansal*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No