



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

215

CRM-M-60616-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.01.2026

Jiwan Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rajdeep Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.24 dated 21.03.2025, registered under Sections 15, 18 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Bareta, District Mansa.

2. Learned Senior counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for about 10 months. The alleged recovery from the petitioner is marginally above the non-commercial quantity, it being 1.5 kg of poppy husk and 2.7 kg of opium from the cabin of the truck. There is non-compliance of mandatory provision of Section 50 of NDPS. No independent witness has been joined at the time of recovery. Co-accused Rajinder Kumar @ Bitta, who was driving the truck has since been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 03.12.2025, after being in custody for about 8 months. Charges have been framed on 05.09.2025 and none, out of 18 PWs, has been examined. He is not involved in any other case.



3. The custody certificate dated 17.01.2026, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 9 months and 25 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from the petitioner and co-accused, who were apprehended at the spot. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage, co-accused having been granted bail and the petitioner being not involved in any other case.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 9 months and 25 days; not involved in any other case; co-accused are on bail; charges were framed on 05.09.2025, however, out of 18 PWs, none has been examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to



the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.

- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

19.01.2026
M.Kamra

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