



323

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

**CRM-M-58155-2023  
Date of Decision:24.04.2025**

SANJU @ SANJEEV

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

**Coram :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.296 dated 20.11.2022, registered under Sections 21(c) of N.D.P.S. Act 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on), Police Station STF Phase-IV Mohali, District Feorzepur.

2. As per prosecution version, the petitioner was apprehended by the police party on suspicion and recovery of 270 gram heroin was made from his conscious possession on 20.11.2022, which is marginally above commercial quantity.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case and no recovery was effected from



him. The petitioner is in custody since 20.11.2022 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. Trial is likely to take long time. No useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. Thus, it is prayed that he may be released on regular bail. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgments in (i) **CRM-M-37684-2021, Balwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 14.02.2022; (ii) **CRM-M-8212-2022, Tajinder Singh vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 03.03.2022 and (iii) **CRM-M-35186-2016, Manjit Kaur @ Jeeto vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 01.12.2016.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, he fairly conceded the fact that petitioner is not involved in any other criminal activity.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, custody period of the petitioner and also the fact that the quantity of alleged contraband is marginally above the 'commercial quantity', but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

6. Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

24.04.2025  
*vipin*

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

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