



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

213

Date of decision: 25.08.2025

1. CRM-M-58637-2024 (O&M)

AMANDEEP SINGH @ AMAN

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

2. CRM-M-35929-2025 (O&M)

SUKHCHAIN SINGH ALIAS KIRCH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. By way of common order, the aforesaid petitions shall be disposed of which have been filed under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, seeking regular bail in FIR No.81 dated 05.07.2023 under Sections 22-C, 25 and 27-A of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa.

2. Status report by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Budhlada, District Mansa on behalf of respondent-State has been filed in Court today and the same is taken on record.



3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners were apprehended by the police being found to be in conscious possession of 10 vials of Wincirex Cough Syrup alongwith 200 intoxicant tablets of Carisoprodol. It is argued that the petitioners themselves are drug addicts and have taken the aforesaid quantity for their use.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners are in custody for the last 11 months and 28 days. He further submits that out of 14 cited prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

5. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail. He does not refute the fact that the petitioners are in custody for the last 11 months and 28 days, and that out of 14 cited prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

7. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the custody undergone by the petitioners is 11 months and 28 days; that out of 14 cited prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

8. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioners are granted the concession of regular bail, on their furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the



petitioners indulge in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioners.

10. However, nothing expressed hereinabove shall have any effect on the merits of the case.

11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

25th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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