



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

209-1

DATE OF DECISION: 28.08.2025

1. **CRR-1637-2024 (O&M)**

ANAND LAL ALIAS NANDU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

2. **CRR-783-2024 (O&M)**

VEER SHAMBHUK @ SHAMBHU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Arjun Sood, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRR-1637-2024).

Mr. Amardeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRR-783-2024).

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 against impugned judgment dated 30.03.2024 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran in FIR No.136 of 30.09.2023 under Sections 21(C), 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Jhabal whereby the bail application(s) *qua* the petitioner(s) has been dismissed.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner no.1 namely Anand Lal @ Nandu who was riding a motorcycle was apprehended alongwith petitioner No.2 namely, Veer Shambhuk @ Shambhu who was sitting as a pillion rider on the said motorcycle from whom 500 grams of *Heroin* has been recovered whereas from the possession of petitioner No.2, 603 grams of Heroin was recovered. Moreover, Rs.80,000/- has also been recovered from petitioner no.1.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that the petitioner(s) have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that after their arrest and upon expiry of the period of police remand, the petitioner(s) were remanded to judicial custody. The investigation in the present case was not completed within the statutory period of 180 days as contemplated under law. Therefore the petitioner(s) have applied for default bail on 29.03.2024 which has been dismissed vide impugned judgment dated 30.03.2024 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the final report under Section 173(2) of Cr.P.C. has been presented before the learned Judge Special Court, Tarn Taran on 30.03.2024 and after filing of final report, the petitioner(s) moved bail application under Section 167(2) of Cr.P.C. before the said Court which was rightly dismissed on the ground that the challan has already been presented against the petitioner(s), as such, the bail application becomes infructuous.

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

6. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances and the fact that it is not controverted by the State that the challan was filed after the lapse



of statutory period of 180 days i.e. on 182nd day of the registration of the aforementioned FIR, therefore the interim order 08.04.2025 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court whereby the petitioner was ordered to be released on interim bail on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds subject to satisfaction of learned Special Court/ CJM/ Duty Magistrate concerned, is hereby **made absolute**.

7. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner(s) indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner(s).

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

28th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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