



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

253

**CRM-M-41039-2025
Date of decision: 05.08.2025**

TARSEM SINGH @ SEMI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**Present:-** Mr. K. S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the second petition which has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.103 dated 15.12.2022 under Section 21(c) and 23 of NDPS Act, 1985 (later on added Section 25 of Arms Act vide GD No. 13 dated 16.12.2022) registered at Police Station Khuhi Khera, District Fazilka.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Sukhdev Singh was arrested and 2.650 kgs of heroin was recovered alongwith drug money amounting to Rs.64.20 lakhs and one pistol alongwith 48 live cartridges was recovered. Thereafter, the petitioner and one Satpal Singh @ Pala were named by Sukhdev Singh co-accused in his disclosure statement. However, no recovery has been effected from the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody for more than 02 years and 07 months and only 02 out of 31 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on



behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing custody certificate dated 04.08.2025 vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner is in custody for 02 years, 07 months and 12 days and only 02 out of 31 prosecution witnesses have been examined.

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

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, custody period undergone by the petitioner and also the fact that only 02 out of 31 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. This Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail in the present case, on her furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during her bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

05th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

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

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