



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

215-2

**CRM-M-14667-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.07.2025**

DARSHAN SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in FIR No.105 dated 07.10.2024 under Section 22 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Bhadson, District Patiala.

2. The allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner is engaged in transport business and supplied the consignments which were received from various customers. It is further stated that the son of the petitioner is running a chemist shop and the alleged contraband was recovered from the said shop whereas nothing has been recovered from the personal possession. It is stated that it is a case where the timeline shows that the police has previously visited the premises of the petitioner's shop and was later on seen carrying a bag which was stated to be bribe.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has nothing to do with the offence as alleged, and a false case has been registered against the petitioner and his son. He further submits that he is in custody since 07.10.2025 and has already undergone custody period of approximately 08 months.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and further states that although challan has been presented, however, charges are yet to be framed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record. The time-line and the allegations levelled against the petitioner, do not cast a doubt on the case of the prosecution at this stage. Moreover, there is no recovery from the present petitioner.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is approximately 08 months and trial *qua* the petitioner is yet to commence, therefore, no useful purpose would be served to further detain the petitioner in jail and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time and as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his 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.

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

07th July, 2025

Sonia Puri

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

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