



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

217

CRM-M-43111-2025
Decided on : 13.08.2025

Lovepreet Singh alias Love . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kanav Goyal, Advocate (**Legal Aid Counsel**)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, 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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Lovepreet Singh alias Love	7	04.07.2018	21/22-61-85 of NDPS Act, 1985	Verka	Amritsar

2. Recovery in the present case is of 495 Alprazolam tablets and the total weight of the same is 64.505 grams, which is much less than the maximum limit of non-commercial quantity, i.e., 100 grams.

3. FIR in the present case was registered on 04.07.2018, and for the first time, he was granted bail on 21.08.2018. Counsel contends that the petitioner was continuously appearing before the trial Court until 14.12.2021, however, on account of his absence on that date, his bail was cancelled and non-bailable warrants were issued. Subsequently, vide order dated 21.03.2023, the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender. However, later on, the



petitioner was again arrested on 13.12.2023 and since then, he is inside jail.

4. Learned counsel further submits that the recovered quantity is non-commercial, and the petitioner, being a young boy of the age of 26 years, is not found to have indulged in any other similar activity, despite being on the run for a period of more than 02 years. Further, out of the total 09 prosecution witnesses, only 01 has been examined so far. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for 01 year, 09 months and 16 days, till 12.08.2025, and except for the present case, he has been shown to be involved in five more cases under various offences, but none of these are under the NDPS Act.

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

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail to the petitioner, submits that the offence is serious in nature and is increasing on a day-to-day basis in the State of Punjab, which has already ruined the lives of youth and their families. The persons who are suppliers of narcotic substances are a major danger to society, and granting bail to such an accused may adversely affect the society. Therefore, applying the principle of parity in this case should not be considered, and the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on 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 is a young man aged 26 years and is, for the first time, involved in a case under the NDPS Act. Besides, the trial is not progressing at the required pace, despite the petitioner being inside jail since



13.12.2023. This Court is of the view that, keeping in view all the parameters, the prayer for bail deserves consideration, giving the petitioner one more opportunity to reform and rehabilitate himself in society.

7. 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

8. 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.

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

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 13, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No