

**CRM-M-34543-2025****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****117****CRM-M-34543-2025****Decided on :20.03.2026**

Jugraj Singh @ Yuvraj Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

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

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

-:-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.76 dated 28.09.2023, under Sections 21(c)/27-A/29 NDPS Act, and Sections 25/27 Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Sri Amant Khan, Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that 750 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered from the dickey of the scooter being driven by the petitioner. Without arguing much on the merits of the case, Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate, submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 2 years, 5 months, and 17 days, and out of a total of 15 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date, to the best of his knowledge.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that nothing was recovered from co-accused Rahul, who was sitting in the middle seat of the motorcycle, whereas co-accused Amritpal Singh, who was occupying the rear seat, was found in possession of a .32 bore pistol, one magazine, and five live cartridges.

**CRM-M-34543-2025****2**

Learned counsel further submits that during the period of incarceration, petitioner has been implicated in number of other cases under the NDPS Act as well as the Arms Act solely on the basis of disclosure statements, without any substantive evidence. In some of those cases, petitioner has already been granted bail. It is contended that, in fact, no recovery of any narcotic contraband or weapon was effected in those cases.

In view of the above, it is argued that the trial is being unnecessarily delayed without any fault on the part of the petitioner. Accordingly, learned counsel prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Learned State counsel, while producing the custody certificate, confirms the factum of the petitioner's custody, i.e. 02 years, 05 months, and 17 days, and does not find himself in a position to controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book along with the documents appended thereto.

9. Perusal of the custody certificate shows that petitioner was arrested at the spot at the time of registration of the FIR on 28.09.2023, whereas the other cases reflected therein pertain to subsequent years, i.e. 2024–2025, when the petitioner was already in custody.

10. In such circumstances, the veracity of the allegations regarding the petitioner's involvement in those subsequent cases would be a matter for the State to establish during the course of trial. However, coupled with the fact that the trial in the present case is not progressing at

**CRM-M-34543-2025****3**

the required pace, petitioner cannot be compelled to remain in custody for an indefinite period. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.03.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No