



238

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

CRM-M-26937-2025

Date of Decision:04.08.2025

KULDEEP SINGH SHEHANSAH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, Deputy, A.G., 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.76 dated 09.07.2023, registered under Sections 22, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act 1985, Police Station Anaj Mandi, District Patiala.

2. As per prosecution version, on the basis of the secret information, the petitioner was apprehended by the police party at the spot and 1040 loose intoxicant tablets having salt Alprazolam (weighing 124.8 grams) were recovered from him and his co-accused on 09.07.2023, 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 09.07.2023 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. He further contends that the prosecution has been able to examine only 03 witnesses out of total 12 witnesses so far and no other case under the provisions of NDPS Act has been registered against the present petitioner. 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 State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his



furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

**04.08.2025**

*vipin*

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)**

**JUDGE**

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