

2025:PHHC:089518



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

238

**CRM-M-22057-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.07.2025**

Satnam Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Bikramjeet Singh Jattana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant one is the second petition that has been filed by the petitioner for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 0109 dated 27.06.2020, registered under Section 22 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) [Sections 25, 27 and 29 of the NDPS Act] at Police Station City-2 Mansa, District Mansa. The first petition, bearing number **CRM-M-51927-2024**, was dismissed as withdrawn on 11.12.2024.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 27.06.2024, co-accused Narinder Kumar @ Neetu was apprehended by a police party headed by ASI Guljit Singh and recovery of 1700 tablets of Clovidol-100 SR, 150 tablets of Alprazolam and drug money of Rs. 47,500/- was effected from him. Since he could not produce any valid permit or license to keep in his possession the recovered drugs, he was formally arrested at the spot. He suffered disclosure statement on 29.06.2020

2025:PHHC:089518



to the effect that the recovered contraband was purchased from the present petitioner for a sum of Rs. 60,000/-. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was nominated in this case as an accused and was arrested on 02.09.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was neither named in the FIR nor was found at the spot. He has been nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by aforesaid co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. No subsequent recovery has been effected from him. He is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act. Even otherwise, investigation stands completed and *challan* has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time. The petitioner is in custody since 02.09.2024. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Co-accused Narinder Kumar @ Neetu has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 15.07.2021 passed in CRM-M-25932-2021. On the grounds of parity, the petitioner too deserves the same benefit. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Status report along with the custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the petitioner is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner has been nominated in this case on the basis of

2025:PHHC:089518



the disclosure statement suffered by above named co-accused. The petitioner was arrested on 02.09.2024. However, no subsequent recovery is shown to be effected from him. He is not shown to be involved in any other case. More so, the main accused, from whose possession the aforesaid recovery of the contraband was effected, has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, as mentioned above. The conclusion of the case is likely to take time. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

22.07.2025

Wasem Ansari(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE*Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes/No**Whether reportable**Yes/No*