



CRM-M-62563-2025

1

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

224

**CRM-M-62563-2025
Decided on :05.02.2026**

Mintu

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Iqbalpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present third petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in FIR No. 61 dated 11.04.2024, under Section 21 of NDPS Act (Sections 61,85,29 of NDPS Act), registered at Police Station Special Task Force, District SAS Nagar Mohali.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-53917-2024 and CRM-M-28051-2025, which were withdrawn at that stage vide orders dated 24.02.2025 and 26.05.2025, respectively.

3. As per the prosecution case, secret information was received that the petitioner, Mintu, who runs a motorcycle repair shop, used to sell Ice drug (Amphetamine), and that he could be apprehended today when

**CRM-M-62563-2025****2**

approaching Toll Plaza Mahmujoiya on foot. Considering the information reliable, the impugned FIR was registered against the petitioner prior to the actual recovery.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was subsequently intercepted by members of the police team and apprehended with 165 grams of Ice drug (Amphetamine) in his possession. Counsel further submits that, although the quantity recovered is commercial in nature, being more than 50 grams, the trial has not progressed at the required pace, as only two prosecution witnesses have been examined to date out of the total 22. Counsel also submits that petitioner is in custody since 14.04.2024, i.e., for the past one year and nine months.

To support his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the order dated 13.01.2026 passed by the coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-62901-2025, wherein the accused in that case was granted bail after being in custody for one year, nine months, and three days, despite recovery of 200 grams of Amphetamine. In view of these facts, learned counsel prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit of Prithipal Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Anti-Narcotics Task Force, Ferozepur Range, Ferozepur in Court today. Same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.

**CRM-M-62563-2025****3**

6. Learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of bail, submitting that petitioner was apprehended in possession of 165 grams of Ice drug (Amphetamine), which constitutes a commercial quantity under the NDPS Act. Considering the seriousness of the offence and the fact that the petitioner has two prior offences under the Prisons Act, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto, including the status report.

8. Undoubtedly, 165 grams of Ice drug were recovered from the possession of the petitioner. As per the status report, trial has not progressed at the required pace, as only 02 prosecution witnesses have been examined out of a total of 22. Petitioner is not alleged to be involved in any other similar activity. Considering the age of the petitioner, i.e., 23 years, and the period of incarceration already undergone by him, this Court finds merit in the prayer for bail. Consequently, present petition is allowed.

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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. 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



CRM-M-62563-2025

4

independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

05.02.2026
Rashmi

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