

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:089569



288

CRM-M-24379-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision:03.07.2026

Gursahib Singh @ Saab

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The instant one is the second petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.191, dated 18.08.2024, registered under Sections 21(c), 25 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'NDPS Act'), at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-No.48402-2025 had been dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 06.03.2026.

2. As per the allegations, on 18.08.2024, the petitioner and co-accused were apprehended and recovery of 883 grams of heroin kept in a plastic packet had been effected from their conscious possession. The

recovered contraband was taken into custody by the police. The petitioner and co-accused were formally arrested. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. A false recovery has been planted upon him. He is in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. His antecedents are clean. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. Each day spent by him in custody furnishes a new ground to him for seeking benefit of bail. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel while relying upon the status report has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as commercial quantity of contraband had been recovered from him and the co-accused. The rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted in this case. It is, therefore, argued that this petition being the successive one is not even maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at length.

6. 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.

7. The previous petition of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn on 06.03.2026. The trial has not progressed much thereafter since no prosecution witness has been examined so far. Therefore, it is obvious that the chances of conclusion of the trial in the near future are bleak. 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 Live Law (SC) 533**, 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 judgment dated 14.11.2025 passed in **Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattishgarh & another passed in Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025**, in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that rigors 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 abovementioned 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 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 passed in 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.

12. 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 for a period of about 01 year, 10 months and 09 days, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future; 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. As such, the prolonged detention of the petitioner amounts to drastic change in circumstances extending fresh ground to petitioner to seek bail.

13. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner. 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 extent of two sureties in the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned, 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 has been exempted by the trial Court. He shall surrender his passport, if any, furnish details of his cell phone and Aadhaar card, and shall not change his mobile number(s) during the pendency of the trial.

14. 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.

15. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

03.07.2026

harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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