



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

232

CRM-M-10710-2025
Decided on : 23.09.2025

Paramjit Singh @ Pankaj @ Fauji . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Amarjeet Singh Prajapati, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Paramjit Singh @ Pankaj @ Fauji	0003	07.01.2025	21, 22, 27A of NDPS Act, 1985 (S. 29 of NDPS Act, added later on)	Fatehgarh Churian	Police District Batala, Gurdaspur

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a young boy aged 25 years. As per the FSL report, the recovery effected from him consists of 8.00 grams of 'Heroin' along with 28 loose tablets containing Etizolam, weighing 1.8 grams in total, and currency notes of Rs.1200/-. It is pointed out that for 'Heroin', the notified small quantity is 5 grams and commercial quantity is more than 250 grams, whereas for Etizolam, the notified small quantity is 10 grams and commercial quantity is 1000 grams. Thus, the recovery in both respects is below the commercial quantity threshold. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 07.01.2025,



i.e., the date of his arrest, and is not involved in any other case of similar nature or under any other provision of law. Learned counsel also points out that charges were framed on 01.08.2025 and out of total 10 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

In view of the above, learned counsel prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of parity.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the offence is serious in nature and the menace of drugs is increasing day by day in the State of Punjab, which has ruined the lives of many youth. It is argued that persons indulging in supply of narcotic substances pose a grave danger to society, and granting bail in such matters may adversely affect the deterrent effect of law.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual submissions made on behalf of the petitioner regarding the nature of recovery, custody period, and non-involvement in any other case.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record with their able assistance, this Court finds substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. It is observed that the petitioner, a young boy aged 25 years, and for the first time got involved in a case under the NDPS Act. The recovery effected from him consists of 8 grams of Heroin and 1.8 grams of Etizolam, both of which fall below the threshold of commercial quantity, and therefore, the rigours of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are not attracted. The trial is not progressing at the required pace, as none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, despite charges having been framed. Keeping in view the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, his clean antecedents, and the need to give him an opportunity to reform and rehabilitate in society, this Court is of the considered view that the prayer for



bail deserves acceptance.

5. Accordingly, considering the totality of circumstances, and the nature allegations leveled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here-above, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 23, 2025

J.Ram

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