



**224-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-34516-2024  
Date of decision: 22.04.2025

Parminder Singh @ Baggi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

**Present:** Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

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

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.150 dated 30.09.2023 under Section 15 (C) of NDPS Act and Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on registered at Police Station Jaitu District Faridkot, Punjab.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that on 30.09.2023, the police intercepted two Honda City cars, one white and one golden in colour. The white car was driven by the accused/petitioner, who was accompanied by co-accused, namely, Ajay Kumar. The golden car was driven by the accused, Kuldeep Singh @ Gaggu, with co-accused, namely, Sona Singh accompanying him. Both vehicles were searched in the presence of a gazetted officer. During the search, the police recovered seven plastic bags each containing 20 kg of poppy husk from the dickey of the white car. Similarly, six plastic bags, each containing 20 kg of poppy husk, were recovered from the golden car and thus, the instant case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the



petitioner has suffered incarceration of more than one year and six months and prosecution has not been able to produce its witnesses. He further submits that till date, out of 24, not even a single prosecution witness has been examined so far, as such, the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the ratio of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Nandlal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal Vs. The State of West Bengal SLP (CrI.) No(s).12788/2023.*** He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

4. Per contra, the learned State counsel opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that 140 kg of poppy husk has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and thus, he is not entitled to any relief. However, he could not controvert the fact that the petitioner is behind the bars for the last more than 01 year and 06 months, he is not involved in any other case and not even a single prosecution witness has been examined so far.

5. 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.”*

6. After perusing the record of the case with the assistance of the



CRM-M-34516-2024

-3-

learned counsel for the parties, it transpires that the petitioner is behind the bars since last more than 01 year and 06 months. Investigation is complete. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court and trial of the case has not made much progress as out of 24 prosecution witnesses, none 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.

7. A two Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Nandlal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal (supra)*** 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 @ 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 @ Pighu 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***



CRM-M-34516-2024

-4-

*@ 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.*

8. 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 their 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)

9. 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 @ Baggi, is ordered to be released on regular bail during trial on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court.

10. 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**

**22.04.2025**

*Neha*

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