

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-72945-2025 (O&M)

Satish @ Mintu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	23.02.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.02.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.02.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Ram Singh Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant one is the third petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 168 dated 16.04.2024, registered under Section 120-B of IPC and Section 20 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station Chandhut, District Palwal. His previous two petitions were dismissed by this Court on 25.02.2025 and 02.09.2025, respectively.
2. The petitioner has been booked in the aforesaid FIR for

2026:PHHC:027952



commission of aforementioned offences on the allegations that on 16.04.2024, he along with the co-accused was found in conscious possession of a commercial quantity of contraband, i.e. *Ganja*. The contraband was kept in six plastic sacks. The petitioner and co-accused were arrested and presently they are facing trial for commission of the aforementioned offence.

3. It is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the present petition, being the third petition, is maintainable since even after dismissal of the previous petitions, till date, not even a single prosecution witness has been examined by the prosecution. The petitioner has been continuously in custody since 16.04.2024. There are no chances of conclusion of the trial even in the near future. His prolonged incarceration militates against his right under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and gives a fresh ground to him to make a prayer for release on bail. It is further urged that the co-accused Doulat @ Doulat Ram and Jitender Pradhan have already been extended the benefit of bail. It is, therefore, prayed that the application deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that there is no substantive or drastic change in circumstances since the dismissal of the earlier petitions. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, as a commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is in custody for a period of 01 year, 10 months and 07 days. Till date, not even a single prosecution witness out of sixteen prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. The petitioner cannot be kept in custody for an indefinite period when the delay is not attributable to him. His

2026:PHHC:027952



antecedents are clean and each passing day gives a fresh ground to him to seek concession of bail. Therefore, the present successive petition is maintainable. 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. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail on account of delay in trial and long period of incarceration is to be considered in the light of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail on account of delay in trial and long period of incarceration is to be considered in the light of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. 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***

2026:PHHC:027952



(Criminal) No.8656 of 2023 decided on 14.09.2023 and Rabi 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 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 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, 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**

2026:PHHC:027952



Criminal Appeal No.4911 of 2025 with regard to recovery of commercial quantity of narcotic substance, the Hon'ble Supreme Court 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 01 year, 10 months and 07 days, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as no prosecution witness has been examined so far; the delay in trial is not attributable to the petitioner, he has clean antecedents, 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.

12. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that a case is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner at this stage. 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 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 is exempted by the trial Court.

2026:PHHC:027952



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.

23.02.2026
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No