

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:003949



242

CRM-M-65611-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:14.01.2026

Baljinder Singh @ Roshan

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Malkiat S. Hundal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The present one is the fourth petition as filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.26 dated 23.08.2023, registered under Section 25 of the Arms Act, Section 120 IPC and Sections 21, 25 and 29 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Special Operation Cell, Amritsar.

2. As per the allegations, on 23.08.2024, a secret information was received to the effect that accused Jodhbir Singh, Prince Singh @ Prince, Malkit @ Meeta and Manpreet Singh @ Manna had formed a gang. They had criminal antecedents and they were planning to commit some major crime in the vicinity of different districts of State of Punjab. It was also informed that they were in occupation of a consignment of illicit weapons

and were planning to deliver the same to some other persons and could be apprehended. Believing the secret information to be true, a raiding party was formed. Ruqa was sent for registration of the FIR. Police reached at the informed place and apprehended accused Malkit Singh @ Meeta, Prince Singh @ Prince and Manpreet Singh @ Manna while they were present in a swift car. On conducting search, 02 pistols .32 bore were recovered along with 10 live bullets from the car. Recovery of some mobile phones was also effected from accused Malkit Singh @ Meeta. Accused Prince suffered a disclosure statement on 28.08.2023, on the basis of which the present petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was apprehended on 30.08.2023 and 26 mobile phones were recovered from him. Co-accused were also arrested subsequently. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. The previous two petitions as filed by the petitioner were dismissed as withdrawn whereas one of the same was dismissed on 16.10.2024.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody for a period of over 02 years, 03 months and 09 days. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as only 03 out of 39 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. The persons, who had allegedly recorded statements against the petitioner qua taking their cell phones have sworn affidavits saying to the contrary. Continued detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. A false recovery has been planted upon him. Rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted qua him. Each day spent by him in custody creates a new ground for seeking benefit of bail to him. It is, therefore, urged

that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that the petitioner is a person of criminal antecedents and has even been convicted in a case under Section 22 of the NDPS Act. The allegations against him are serious in nature. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that this being the successive bail application is not even maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have been found in possession of 26 cell phones, which were allegedly taken by him from different persons in return of supply of contraband to those persons. The petitioner has placed on record Annexure P-2, copies of affidavits filed by him of those persons. Though, no consideration can be given to this document at this stage, and the allegations make out a prima facie case for commission of subject offence against him, however, he is in custody for a period of over 02 years, 03 months and 09 days. This factor, in the opinion of this Court, is a ground to move for bail afresh. The Hon'ble Apex Court has observed in a catena of cases that an accused cannot be kept in custody for an indefinite period of time, and the bail application can be considered on its own merits even if it is filed repeatedly. It has also been held that every day spent in custody can provide a new cause of action for filing a bail application under certain circumstances. This principle is a part of the broader approach emphasizing that law prefers bail over jail, aiming to balance the rights of the accused

with the requirements of the criminal justice system. Prolonged detention itself is a ground for reconsideration of bail since the settled principle of law is that detention prior to trial should not become punitive. There are no chances of the conclusion of the trial in near future since only 03 out of 39 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Involvement of the petitioner in other case cannot be considered to be a ground for denying benefit of bail to him. Rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act cannot be stated to be attracted against him. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the observations made by Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain v. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352***, wherein it was 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 of Cr.P.C. which is applicable to offence under the Act. It was also observed that jails are overcrowded and their living conditions are, more often than not, appalling. The danger of unjustified imprisonment is that inmates are more likely to be hardened rather than reformed. Reliance can also be placed upon ***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***, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court had extended benefit of bail to the accused who had been incarcerated for a long period by observing that prolonged incarceration militated 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.

7. Reliance can also be placed upon ***Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattishgarh & Anr., Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025***, which is a recently pronounced verdict of Hon'ble Supreme Court observing that rigors 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 abovementioned 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. The similar benefit has been extended 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.***

11. On analyzing the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case in the light of the aforementioned principles of law, it transpires that the petitioner has suffered prolonged incarceration for a period of 02 years , 03 months and 09 days, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as only 03 out of 39 prosecution witnesses have been examined; the continued detention of the petitioner is not likely to serve any fruitful purpose; there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate in the trial or will abscond. As such, the prolonged detention of the petitioner amounts to drastic change in circumstances extending fresh ground to petitioner to seek bail.

12. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the extent of two sureties in the like amount each, to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, and subject to the condition that he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case. He shall appear before the learned trial Court on each and every date of hearing except when his presence has been exempted by the trial Court. He shall surrender his passport, if any, furnish details of his cell phone and Aadhaar card, and shall not change his mobile number(s) during the pendency of the trial.

13. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be

construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

14. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

14.01.2026

harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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