



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

112+220

**CRM-3186-2026 IN/&
CRM-M-36681-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 29.01.2026**

Pappu Singh @Sumana

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)**CRM-3186-2026**

This is an application seeking for placing on record the orders passed in petition for bail, moved by the petitioner earlier. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is hereby allowed and the orders annexed with the application are taken on record.

CRM-M-36681-2025

2. For the commission of offence punishable under Section 22 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, hereinafter being referred to as 'NDPS Act', the FIR No.04 dated 07.01.2023, has been lodged in Police Station Amargarh, District Malerkotla. The petitioner is being prosecuted for the commission of abovementioned offence. He has been arrested. The petitioner is in custody and, therefore, craving for bail. This is



third petition for bail filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emanating from the record are that the FIR in this case came into being when a police party headed by 'ASI Sukhchain Singh' was on patrolling duty near Bagaria spotted a person moving on foot, and carrying a transparent plastic bag in his hand. According to above-named police officer, when the abovesaid person noticed the presence of police party, he got scared and tried to run away by throwing the transparent bag.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of suspicion, when the abovesaid person was apprehended and the contents of polythene bag thrown by him were checked, it was found that in the abovementioned bag, he was carrying 11 vials of intoxicating substance.

4. It has been further alleged by the prosecution that on recovery of abovementioned contraband, necessary formalities with regard to seizure & sealing of contraband, lodging of FIR, and arrest of the accused were performed and further investigation taken up.

5. The learned State Counsel has already filed reply to the petition. Custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed today. The same be taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that although this is third petition for bail moved by the petitioner, yet the same is



maintainable, as there is change in circumstance from the date of dismissal of second bail petition, which was decided almost one year ago. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, after dismissal of second bail petition, no significant change in circumstances has taken place, and therefore, the petitioner has got a right to maintain the present petition.

8. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has already served sentence for a period of more than 03 years, and that trial is taking place at a very slow, as out of 16 prosecution witnesses, only 8 have been examined so far. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the lower threshold meant for commercial quantity of codeine phosphate is 01 kg, but the contraband found in possession of petitioner was 01 kg and 363.67 gms, i.e. marginally above the abovesaid limit. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, since the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

9. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, the allegations against the petitioner are for being in possession of commercial quantity of contraband, and that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition, no significant change in circumstances has taken place. As per learned State Counsel, the quantity of contraband, recovered in this case, comes within the ambit of 'commercial quantity', and therefore, unless the twin conditions enshrined under Section-37 of NDPS Act stands satisfied, the benefit of bail cannot be afforded to the petitioner.

10. The record has been perused carefully.



11. As far as the principles governing the benefit of bail in a case related to NDPS Act, are concerned, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of 'Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain v. State' (NCT of Delhi), 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352 are relevant, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has 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 which is applicable to offences under the Act.

12. In this regard it is also relevant to mention here that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Manmandal and Another v. State of West Bengal', Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.8656 of 2023 decided on 14.09.2023 and 'Rabdi Prakash v. State of Odisha', 2023 SCC Online SC 110, extended the benefit of bail to the accused, who had been incarcerated for a period of almost 2-3 years and the trial was likely to take considerable time. The above-mentioned benefit has been given by observing that prolonged incarceration generally militates 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.

13. In addition to above, in a recently pronounced verdict in the case of 'Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattishgarh & Anr.' Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed 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 of India 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.

14. 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 of India, 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.

15. 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 of India 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.

16. The similar benefit has been taken 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.

17. In the case of ‘Hasanujjaman & Ors. V/s The State of West Bengal’ SLP (Crl.) No.3221 of 2023, the benefit of bail has been accorded by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India to an accused, who was found in the possession of 115 bottles of phensedyl, after considering that he was in



custody for a period of about 01 year and 03 months. It has been further observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the abovementioned case that 'the investigation is complete; chargesheet has been filed, though the charges are yet to be framed. The conclusion of trial will, thus, take some reasonable time, regardless of the direction issued by the High Court to conclude the same within one year from the date of framing of charges. The petitioners do not have any criminal antecedents. There is, thus, substantial compliance of Section-37 of NDPS Act'.

18. Similarly, in the case of 'Nandlal Mondal @Abhay Mondal V/s The State of West Bengal' SLP(CrI) No.12788/2023, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has observed that the benefit of bail was afforded to the accused, who was found in possession of 10,000 ml of codeine phosphate, after a gap of one and a half year by considering that conclusion of trial would take long time.

19. If the facts and circumstances of the present case are analyzed in the light of above-mentioned principles of law, it transpires that:-

- (i) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 03 years and 18 days;
- (ii) that the trial is taking place at a slow pace, as out of 16 prosecution witnesses, only 08 have been examined so far;
- (iii) that the recovered contraband is marginally above the lower limit prescribed for 'commercial quantity' of codeine phosphate;



- (iv) that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition, a period of almost one year has elapsed, and no significant progress has taken place;
- (v) that nothing is left to be recovered from possession of petitioner;
- (vi) that detention of petitioner in judicial lock up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- (vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- (viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not co-operate/participate in the trial.

20. In the present case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another", 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, are relevant, wherein it has been observed that "a fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for



longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case”.

21. The principles laid down by the Hon’ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another’, (2022) 10 SCC 51, are also relevant in this case. In the abovementioned case, it has been observed that “the rate of conviction in criminal cases in India is abysmally low. It appears to us that this factor weighs on the mind of the Court while deciding the bail applications in a negative sense. Courts tend to think that the possibility of a conviction being nearer to rarity, bail applications will have to be decided strictly, contrary to legal principles. We cannot mix up consideration of a bail application, which is not punitive in nature with that of a possible adjudication by way of trial. On the contrary, an ultimate acquittal with continued custody would be a case of grave injustice”.

22. Recently, in the case of ‘Tapas Kumar Palit Vs. State of Chhattisgarh’, 2025 SCC Online SC 322, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has observed that “if an accused is to get a final verdict after incarceration of six to seven years in jail as an undertrial prisoner, then,



definitely, it could be said that his right to have a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution has been infringed”. It has also been observed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the abovementioned case that “delays are bad for the accused and extremely bad for the victims, for Indian society and for the credibility of our justice system, which is valued. Judges are the masters of their Courtrooms and the Criminal Procedure Code provides many tools for the Judges to use in order to ensure that cases proceed efficiently”.

23. Therefore, to elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to the accused as mandated by Hon’ble Apex court in “Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and Another”, 2024 SCC Online SC 4354.

24. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

25. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby **allowed**. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court. However the abovementioned concession shall be subject to following conditions:-

- (i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with



the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

- (ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the final decision of the trial; and
- (iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

29.01.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No