



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

241

**CRM-M-33411-2025
Date of decision: 07.07.2025**

Vicky Singh @ Kalu

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this 3rd petition filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C., is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.101 dated 26.06.2023 registered under Sections 22 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (in short 'the NDPS Act') at Police Station Passiana, District Patiala.

2. The 2nd petition filed by the petitioner seeking the concession of regular bail was dismissed as withdrawn on 08.11.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this 3rd petition has been filed as the petitioner has suffered the incarceration of almost 1½ years.

4. As per the prosecution case, on 26.06.2023, Sub-Inspector Kuldeep Singh, along with other police officials, was conducting surveillance near the bypass bridge at Village Passiana, Patiala, when a white Swift car bearing registration No.PB11-CB-0645 was seen



coming from Patiala bypass. Upon noticing the police, the driver of the car attempted to flee but was intercepted. While running, the suspect threw a black polythene bag to the side of the road. The individual was apprehended and identified as Vicky Singh @ Kalu, son of Boli Ram, resident of Village Sher Majra, District Patiala. After being informed of his legal right to be searched before a Gazetted Officer or Magistrate, Vicky Singh consented to be searched by the police on the spot. A consent memo was duly prepared and signed by him and the witnesses. Upon searching the polythene bag, the police recovered 1,150 loose orange colored intoxicant tablets. The tablets were seized, sealed, and taken into possession as per the procedure. Thereafter, the impugned FIR was registered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that petitioner is a young individual aged about 25 years with no previous involvement in any criminal activity and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the alleged recovery was not made from the petitioner's person but from a public place, raising serious doubts about the genuineness of the recovery and the possibility of false implication. The safeguards under Section 50 of the NDPS Act were not meaningfully explained or properly followed, and the so-called consent memo is neither witnessed by any independent person nor supported by any recording. Despite the incident allegedly taking place in a public area, no effort was made to associate independent witnesses, which further weakens the prosecution version.



6. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there are total 11 prosecution witnesses cited in the list of witnesses, out of which, only 01 PW has been examined till date and 02 PWs have been given up and the trial is likely to take long time in conclusion.

7. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate today in the Court which is taken on record and he opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that huge quantity of contraband was recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, which falls within the ambit of commercial quantity and as such, the petitioner is not entitled for any relief, however, he could not controvert the fact that the petitioner is the first offender and is not involved in any other case.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case, it transpires that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last 01 year, 05 months and 24 days. Investigation is complete. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court. Charges were framed and trial of the case has not made much progress. Out of 11 prosecution witnesses, only 01 PW has been examined so far and 02 PWs have been given up.

9. A two Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Nandlal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No(s).12788/2023*** released the accused on bail after completion of 18 months of custody on account of protracted trial in NDPS case involving commercial quantity of contraband. Reliance in this regard



can also be placed upon the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in *Md. Aliul Islam @ Aliul Islam @ Alius Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No. 000736/2024*, *Debrata Mondal Vs. State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 14970-2023*, *Santarul Islam @ Santa Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 13169/2023*, *Indrajit Mondal @ Piglu Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 8512/2023*, *Narjul Islam @ Najbul Hoque Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 14172/2023*, *Subhashri Das @ Rana @ Subhoshree Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No.15284/2023*, *Mithun Sk. & Anr. Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No.016598/2023*, *SK. Nasiruddin @ Nasirddin SK. Vs. State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No.003402/2024*, *Indadul Shah Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 12670/2023*, *Hanef Kharsani @ Hanef Sheikh Vs. Union of India, Ripon Seikh & Ors. Vs. State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 16663/2023*, *Moidul Sarkar Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 15668/ 2023*, *Saniya Bibi @ Soniya Bibi Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 2354/2024*, *Saddam Hossain Vs. State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 15496/2023*, *Bijon SK @ Golam Murselim Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No. 6046/2024* and *Subhas Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 8823/2019*.

10. Further, the culpability, if any, would be determined at the time of trial and as such, no useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner-accused. Keeping the petitioners in further



detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future, would be violative of their rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. A two Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain vs. State (NCT of Delhi) 2023 AIR SC 1648*, has held that the concept of fairness enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India would trump the bar on granting bail in cases involving commercial quantity of contraband, as stipulated by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Speaking through Justice S. Ravindra Bhat, has opined as follows:

*“20. The standard to be considered therefore, is one, where the court would look at the material in a broad manner, and reasonably see whether the accused’s guilt may be proved. The judgments of this court have, therefore, emphasized that the satisfaction which courts are expected to record, i.e., that the accused may not be guilty, is only prima facie, based on a reasonable reading, which does not call for meticulous examination of the materials collected during investigation (as held in Union of India v. Rattan Malik). **Grant of bail on ground of undue delay in trial, cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the Act, given the imperative of Section 436A which is applicable to offences under the NDPS Act too (ref. Satender Kumar Antil supra).** Having regard to these factors the court is of the opinion that in the facts of this case, the appellant deserves to be enlarged on bail.*

*21. **Before parting, it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual***



is immeasurable. *Jails are overcrowded and their living conditions, more often than not, appalling.*” (emphasis added)

11. A two Judge Bench of Hon’ble Supreme Court in **“*Satender Kumar Antil vs. CBI*”, (2022) 10 SCC 51**, with respect to prevailing conditions of undertrial prisoner in India has observed:

“6. Jails in India are flooded with undertrial prisoners. The statistics placed before us would indicate that more than 2/3rd of the inmates of the prisons constitute undertrial prisoners. Of this category of prisoners, majority may not even be required to be arrested despite registration of a cognizable offence, being charged with offences punishable for seven years or less. They are not only poor and illiterate but also would include women. Thus, there is a culture of offence being inherited by many of them. As observed by this Court, it certainly exhibits the mindset, a vestige of colonial India, on the part of the investigating agency, notwithstanding the fact arrest is a draconian measure resulting in curtailment of liberty, and thus to be used sparingly. In a democracy, there can never be an impression that it is a police State as both are conceptually opposite to each other.”

12. In view the discussion above, the present petition is allowed. Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petitioner namely Vicky Singh @ Kalu is ordered to be released on regular bail during pendency of the trial, on furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.



13. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

07.07.2025

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No