

2026.PHHC.044697



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CRM-M-70527-2025

Date of decision: 20th March, 2026

Shankar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Amaninder Preet, Legal Aid counsel
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 182 dated 09.05.2025 registered under Sections 22 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') (Section 223 of BNS added later on) at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

2. As per the allegations, on 09.05.2025, on receipt of a secret information the petitioner along with the co-accused Vicky Sharma and Jashanpreet Singh was apprehended and recovery of 40 tablets of Etizolam and 600 capsules of Pregabalin were recovered from their conscious possession which were taken into possession by the police. The petitioner and co-accused were formally arrested. Investigation now stands concluded.

2026.PHHC.044697



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since long. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. The mandatory provisions of NDPS Act were not complied with by the investigating agency. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the fact that the recovery was of commercial quantity of intoxicating tablets/capsules and that rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted in this case, he does not deserve to be released on bail. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The commercial quantity of intoxicating tablets/capsules were recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and co-accused. The rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act are obviously attracted in this case. The antecedents of the petitioner are not clean as he is involved in one more case. There is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

2026.PHHC.044697



7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

8. Since the main petition has already been decided, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

20th March, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |