



228

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

CRM-M-12200-2025

Date of decision: 26.05.2025

Parminder Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR****Present:** Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

This fourth petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.178 dated 23.06.2023 under Section 15-C of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station Special Task Force, Sector 79, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that third petition was dismissed as withdrawn on 13.11.2024 and this petition has been filed with the changed circumstances as co-accused, namely, Vijaypal Singh, has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 12.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-2943-2025 titled as 'Vijaypal Singh Vs. State of Punjab'.

The facts of the present case are that on 23.06.2023, the police party headed by ASI Kulbir Singh were present at Malout, where he received a phone call from ASI Gurmeet Singh that he had stopped a Truck and a car and he had suspicion that there may be some intoxicant substance in the said Truck and Car Investigating Officer alongwith police party reached at the spot and on checking the car, 4 bags containing 20 Kgs of poppy husk in each were



CRM-M-12200-2025

-2-

recovered. On checking the Truck, 5 bags containing 20 Kgs of poppy husk in each were recovered. The person standing by the side of car disclosed his name as Parminder Singh (petitioner herein) and the persons standing near the truck disclosed their names as Vijay Pal and Ramesh Kumar. Thus, total 180 Kgs poppy husk was recovered from the aforesaid accused persons.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is in judicial custody since 26.06.2023 and has undergone more than 01 year and 10 months 29 days of custody and till date only one prosecution witness has been examined out of total 30 PWs. As such case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the ratio of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Nandlal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No(s).12788/2023.***

Learned State counsel produces the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record and *per contra*, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that 180 kg of poppy husk was recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, which falls within the ambit of commercial quantity. He further submits that the petitioner is involved in one more case. As such, he is not entitled to grant of regular bail by this Court. However, he could not controvert the fact that out of total 30 prosecution witnesses, only one PW has been examined till date and the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year 10 months and 29 days.

A two Judge Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '***Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI***' (2022) 10 SCC 51, with respect to prevailing conditions of undertrial prisoner in India has observed:



*“6. Jails in India are flooded with undertrial prisoners. The statistics placed before us would indicate that more than 2/3rd of the inmates of the prisons constitute undertrial prisoners. Of this category of prisoners, majority may not even be required to be arrested despite registration of a cognizable offence, being charged with offences punishable for seven years or less. They are not only poor and illiterate but also would include women. Thus, there is a culture of offence being inherited by many of them. As observed by this Court, it certainly exhibits the mindset, a vestige of colonial India, on the part of the investigating agency, notwithstanding the fact arrest is a draconian measure resulting in curtailment of liberty, and thus to be used sparingly. In a democracy, there can never be an impression that it is a police State as both are conceptually opposite to each other.”*

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case, it transpires that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last 01 year 10 months and 9 days. Investigation is complete. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court and trial of the case is yet to commence as out of total 30 PWs, only one prosecution witness has been examined so far. The culpability, if any, would be determined at the time of trial. No useful purpose shall be served by further detention of the accused/petitioner.

A two Judge bench of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Nandlal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No(s).12788/2023*** released the accused on bail after completion of 18 months of custody on account of protracted trial in NDPS case involving commercial quantity of contraband. Reliance in this regard can also be placed upon the judgments rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court passed in ***Md. Aliul Islam***



CRM-M-12200-2025

-4-

*@ Aliul Islam @ Alius Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No. 000736/2024, Debrata Mondal Vs. State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 14970-2023, Santarul Islam @ Santa Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 13169/2023, Indrajit Mondal @ Piglu Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 8512/2023, Narjul Islam @ Najbul Hoque Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 14172/2023, Subhashri Das @ Rana @ Subhoshree Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No.15284/2023, Mithun Sk. & Anr. Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No.016598/2023, SK. Nasiruddin @ Nasirddin SK. Vs. State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No.003402/2024, Indadul Shah Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 12670/2023 , Hanef Kharsani @ Hanef Sheikh Vs. Union of India, Ripon Seikh & Ors. Vs. State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 16663/2023, Moidul Sarkar Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 15668/ 2023, Saniya Bibi @ Soniya Bibi Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 2354/2024, Saddam Hossain Vs. State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 15496/2023, Bijon SK @ Golam Murselim Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No. 6046/2024 and Subhas Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP(Crl.) No. 8823/2019.*

Further, the culpability, if any, would be determined at the time of trial and as such, no useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner-accused. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future, would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. A two Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain vs. State (NCT of Delhi) 2023 AIR SC 1648*, has held that the concept of fairness enshrined under



Article 21 of the Constitution of India would trump the bar on granting bail in cases involving commercial quantity of contraband, as stipulated by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Speaking through Justice S. Ravindra Bhat, has opined as follows:

*“20. The standard to be considered therefore, is one, where the court would look at the material in a broad manner, and reasonably see whether the accused’s guilt may be proved. The judgments of this court have, therefore, emphasized that the satisfaction which courts are expected to record, i.e., that the accused may not be guilty, is only prima facie, based on a reasonable reading, which does not call for meticulous examination of the materials collected during investigation (as held in *Union of India v. Rattan Malik*). **Grant of bail on ground of undue delay in trial, cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the Act, given the imperative of Section 436A which is applicable to offences under the NDPS Act too (ref. *Satender Kumar Antil supra*)**. Having regard to these factors the court is of the opinion that in the facts of this case, the appellant deserves to be enlarged on bail.*

*21. **Before parting, it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable. Jails are overcrowded and their living conditions, more often than not, appalling.**” (emphasis added)*

Keeping in view the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in ‘**Prabhakar Tewari Vs. State of U.P. and another**’ 2020 (1) R.C.R. (Criminal 831) and ‘**Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and Another**’, 2012 (2) SCC 382, the involvement of the petitioner in other cases would not be a ground to refuse grant of concession of regular bail.

In view the above, the present petition is allowed. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial, the petitioner-Parminder Singh is ordered to be released on regular bail



**CRM-M-12200-2025**

**-6-**

during trial on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

**26.05.2025**

*Neha*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No