



CRM-M-26598-2024

1

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

111-3

CRM-M-26598-2024

Date of decision: 25.08.2025

Ravi Singh @ Ajay

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Prabhjot Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Bikramjeet Singh Jatana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurpartap S. Bhullar, AAG Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0113 dated 24.08.2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 21 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Amargarh District Malerkotla).
2. The petitioner was extended the concession of interim bail vide order dated 23.05.2025 passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court. This Court does not deem it appropriate to reproduce the same lest it may burden the instant order.
3. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record, especially keeping in view the factum of the reasons recorded in the order dated 23.05.2025 (whereby the interim bail was extended to the petitioner) as also the petitioner, admittedly, not having misused the concession of interim regular bail, this Court is inclined to confirm the said order. As per custody certificate dated 24.08.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a



period of 01 year, 08 months and 26 days. Further, as per the said custody certificate the petitioner is stated to be involved in 01 more case. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail qua the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in CRM-M No.38822-2022 titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

4. In view of above, the present petition is allowed and interim order dated 23.05.2025 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on the already furnished bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned Special Court, NDPS Act/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned Special Court, NDPS Act/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.



- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
- (viii) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned Special Judge of NDPS Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise, the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

5. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned Special Court, NDPS Act/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.



8. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

August 25, 2025
Ajay

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No