



218

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

**CRM-M No.28905 of 2026
Date of Decision:26.05.2026**

Gurpreet Singh @ Raja

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Niharika Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ekompal Sagoo, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0086, dated 11.07.2021, under Section 21(c) of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Jhabal, District Tarn Taran, Punjab.
2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the police party was on patrolling on 11.07.2021 and when they reached the turn of Bir Baba Buddha Sahib Ji, they saw one clean shaven person was standing there, who on seeing the police, got perplexed and threw a heavy plastic bag being carried by him in his hand and started turning towards Bir Baba Buddha Sahib, however, he was apprehended by the police party. On asking, he disclosed his name to be Gurpreet Singh @ Raja. He was



suspected to be carrying some contraband in the bag, being thrown by him and thus, search of the same was conducted. On conducting the search of the bag, 275 grams of heroin was recovered. He failed to produce any licence regarding the conscious possession of the same, thus, the FIR was registered and he was arrested on the spot. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 09.03.2022. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-41565-2023, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 06.11.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that inadvertently, in the head note of the present petition, it was mentioned that it is the first petition instead of the second petition as the petitioner was earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-41565-2023, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 06.11.2024 and thus, prays that the same may kindly be corrected and the same be read as second petition praying for the



grant of regular bail instead of first petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

4. Allowed as prayed for.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case in a clandestine manner. She has submitted that the alleged recovery of 275 grams of heroin was shown from the petitioner in a public place, however, no independent witness was joined. She has submitted that the recovery has been effected from the alleged plastic bag and not from the personal search of the petitioner and thus, conscious possession of the petitioner is not proved. She has submitted that as the petitioner is falsely implicated in other cases, however, he has been implicated in the present case in a premeditated manner and in majority of the cases, either he is on bail or has been acquitted. She has submitted that the recovery of heroin of 275 grams has been planted upon the petitioner. To buttress her arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the quantity above 250 grams of heroin is commercial in nature, whereas in the present case, it is 275 grams of heroin. She has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last about 05 years but till date, he is facing the trial and thus, his right of speedy trial has been miserably defeated. She has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the recovery effected in the present case from the



petitioner is 275 grams of heroin, which is a commercial quantity, and, thus, the provisions of Section 37 of NDPS Act are attracted. He has submitted that the recovery effected on due compliance of provisions of Section 50 of NDPS Act. He has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is involved in 11 other cases. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, only 04 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

7. Heard.

8. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 11.07.2021 on the allegations of the recovery of 275 grams of heroin and since then, he is behind bars. As submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is a violation of mandatory provisions of Section 50 of NDPS Act. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 04 years, 10 months and 12 days as on 25.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 15 other cases, however, in 06 of the cases, he is on bail, in 01 case, he has already undergone the sentence and in 01 case, he has been acquitted. Out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 04 witnesses have been examined so far.

9. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Mohd Muslim @ Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 LiveLaw(SC)260*, this Court is of the opinion that the case of the petitioner is covered by the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In the abovesaid case Hon'ble



Supreme Court expressed its views as under:-

19. *A plain and literal interpretation of the conditions under Section 37 (i.e., that Court should be satisfied that the accused is not guilty and would not commit any offence) would effectively exclude grant of bail altogether, resulting in punitive detention and unsanctioned preventive detention as well. Therefore, the only manner in which such special conditions as enacted under Section 37 can be considered within constitutional parameters is where the court is reasonably satisfied on a prima facie look at the material on record (whenever the bail application is made) that the accused is not guilty. Any other interpretation, would result in complete denial of the bail to a person accused of offences such as those enacted under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.*

20. xxxxx

21. *.....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.*

22. xxxxx

23. *There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, “as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal”²² (also see Donald Clemmer’s ‘The Prison Community’ published in 1940²³). Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials – especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up*



and concluded speedily.”

10. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695* has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

11. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in *Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024*, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

12. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

13. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail.

14. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner

is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

15. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.05.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No