



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

229

CRM-M-52550-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 23.09.2025

Vishal Ram . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Mandan Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, 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 |
|-----------------------|---------|------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Vishal Ram | 289 | 22.10.2022 | 22, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 | Sultanpur Lodhi | Kapurthala |

2. Petitioner – Vishal Ram, along with his associate Sarabjit Singh, was in a Swift Car bearing registration No. PB28-D-7795, and said car was being driven by the co-accused Sarabjit Singh, whereas, petitioner was sitting beside him. On search of the said car, the police team recovered 1150 intoxicant tablets kept in a polythene bag, whereupon, both the accused were arrested on the spot. At the first instance, petitioner was granted interim bail as the FSL report was not available. However, he was directed to surrender after filing of challan and receipt of the FSL report, but he evaded proceedings of the Court below. Subsequently, on 22.05.2025, petitioner was produced before the trial



Court and since then he is in custody.

3. Learned counsel contends that prior to the release on interim bail, petitioner had already remained in custody for more than 07 months and 30 days. It is further submitted that the maximum of non-commercial quantity of Alprazolam is 100 grams, whereas in the present case, the salt of Alprazolam in the recovered tablets was found to be 113.85 grams. Thus, the recovered substance is only marginally above the maximum of non-commercial quantity.

4. Learned counsel further submits that as on 22.09.2025, the petitioner has undergone a total custody period of about 07 months and 30 days. It is also submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any other case, either of similar nature or of any other criminal offence.

Attention is drawn to the fact that co-accused Sarabjit Singh has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 04.09.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed in CRM-M-34063-2025, titled "*Sarabjit Singh v. State of Punjab*". It is contended that since co-accused 'Sarabjit Singh' was the driver of the car at the time of recovery, the case of the present petitioner stands on an even better footing. Accordingly, on the ground of parity also, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 22.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

6. While opposing the prayer for bail, learned State counsel submits that the offence is serious in nature and the menace of drugs is rapidly



increasing in the State of Punjab, which has already devastated the lives of youth and their families. However, he fairly concedes that the petitioner has been in custody for about 7 months and 30 days and, as per custody certificate, he is not shown to be involved in any other case. He does not dispute the other factual assertions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and also affirms that, though the investigation stands completed and challan has been presented, charges are yet to be framed.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court finds substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner. It is noticed that the petitioner has remained in custody for about 07 months and 30 days, and as the trial has not yet commenced, its conclusion shall take considerable time.

Furthermore, the petitioner is a young man of about 22 years of age. Keeping in view the custody already undergone, the marginal difference in the recovered quantity, the parameters settled by law, and the fact that co-accused Sarabjit Singh has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 04.09.2025 (Annexure P-4), this Court is of the considered view that the prayer for bail deserves acceptance, so as to give the petitioner an opportunity to reform and rehabilitate himself in society.

8. 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.

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**.

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