

2025:PHHC:094699



CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&amp;M)

115 (1<sup>st</sup> case)**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision: July 29, 2025**

Daler Masih

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL****Present:-** Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan Singh Rai, Senior DAG Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.13 dated 03.03.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 22, 25, 29, 27-A of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as 'NDPS Act'), at Police Station Bhindi Saidan, Amritsar Rural.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner is accused of being involved in an FIR pertaining to NDPS Act, involving recovery of 250 intoxicant tablets, i.e. 97 grams of Tramadol, and Rs.1,000/- allegedly being drug money, from the petitioner.

2025:PHHC:094699



CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&M)

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 03.03.2025. Learned counsel has further submitted that the prosecution version, available at this stage, suffers from inherent defects as the mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act have not scrupulously been complied with. Learned counsel has further iterated that the contraband is non-commercial in nature and it is only on account of alleged recovery of drug money of Rs.1,000/- that the police has sought to invoke provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act, so as to debar the petitioner from securing bail.

Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the instant bail plea is barred by the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act, and thus, the same ought to be dismissed. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 24.07.2025 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 03.03.2025 and is in continuous custody since then. The contraband alleged to have been recovered from the petitioner is essentially non-commercial in nature. The basis upon which the police is stating that the amount of Rs.1,000/- recovered from the petitioner is drug money, is only the confessional statement of co-accused. The rival

2025:PHHC:094699



CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&M)

contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

7. As per custody certificate dated 24.07.2025 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than 04 months & is not shown to be involved in any other case/ FIR. In this view of the matter, the rigor imposed under Section 37 of the NDPS Act stands diluted in light of the Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

8. In the factual milieu of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that fetters of Section 37 of the NDPS Act have been met with so as to enlarge the petitioner on bail. It would be apposite to refer a judgment of this Court in *Jaswinder Singh alias Kala versus State of Punjab* passed in *CRM-M-33729-2025 (2025:PHHC:089161)*; the relevant whereof reads thus:

“14. As a sequitur to above-said rumination, the following postulates emerge:

(I) (i) A bail plea on merits; in respect of an FIR under NDPS Act of 1985 involving offence(s) under Section 19 or Section 24 or Section 27-A thereof and for offence(s) involving commercial quantity; is essentially required to meet with the rigour(s) of Section 37 of NDPS Act.

(ii) The rigour(s) of Section 37 of NDPS Act do not apply to a bail plea(s) on medical ground(s), interim bail

2025:PHHC:094699



CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&amp;M)

*on account of any exigency including the reason of demise of a close family relative etc.*

*(iii) The rigour(s) of Section 37 of NDPS Act pale into oblivion when bail is sought for on account of long incarceration in view of Article 21 of the Constitution of India i.e. where the bail-applicant has suffered long under-trial custody, the trial is procrastinating and folly thereof is not attributable to such bail-applicant.*

*II. The twin conditions contained in Section 37(1)(b) of NDPS Act are in addition to the conditions/parameters contained in Cr.P.C./BNSS or any other applicable extant law.*

*III. The twin conditions contained in Section 37(1)(b) of NDPS Act are cumulative in nature and not alternative i.e. both the conditions are required to be satisfied for a bail-plea to be successful.*

*IV. For consideration by bail Court of the condition stipulated in Section 37(1)(b)(i) of NDPS Act i.e. “there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence”:*

*(i) The bail Court ought to sift through all relevant material, including case-dairy, exclusively for the limited purpose of adjudicating such bail plea.*

*(ii) Such consideration, concerning the assessment of guilt or innocence, should not mirror the same degree of scrutiny required for an acquittal of the accused at the final adjudication & culmination of trial.*

*(iii) Plea(s) of defence by applicant-accused, if any, including material/documents in support thereof, may be looked into by the bail-Court while adjudicating such bail plea.*

*V. For consideration of the condition stipulated in Section 37(1)(b)(ii) i.e. ‘he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail’:*

*(i) The word ‘likely’ ought to be interpreted as requiring a demonstrable and substantial*

2025:PHHC:094699



CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&amp;M)

*probability of re-offending by the bail-applicant, rather than a mere theoretical one, as no Court can predict future conduct of the bail-applicant.*

*(ii) The entire factual matrix of a given case including the antecedents of the bail-applicant, role ascribed to him, and the nature of offence are required to be delved into. However, the involvement of bail-applicant in another NDPS/other offence cannot ipso facto result in the conclusion of his propensity for committing offence in the future.*

*(iii) The bail-Court may, at the time of granting bail, impose upon the applicant-accused a condition that he would submit, at such regular time period/interval as may stipulated by the Court granting bail, an affidavit before concerned Special Judge of NDPS Court/Illaqe (Jurisdictional) Judicial Magistrate/concerned Police Station, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In the facts of a given case, imposition of such condition may be considered to be sufficient for satisfaction of condition enumerated in Section 37(1)(b)(ii).*

*VI. There is no gainsaying that the nature, mode and extent of exercise of power by a Court; while satisfying itself regarding the conditions stipulated in Section 37 of NDPS Act; shall depend upon the judicial discretion exercised by such Court in the facts and circumstances of a given case. No exhaustive guidelines can possibly be laid down as to what would constitute parameters for satisfaction of requirement under Section 37 (ibid) as every case has its own unique facts/circumstances. Making such an attempt is nothing but a utopian endeavour. Ergo, this issue is best left to the judicial wisdom and discretion of the Court dealing with such matter.”*

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

2025:PHHC:094699



CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&amp;M)

9. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/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 trial 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.

10. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the

2025:PHHC:094699



CRM-M-34208-2025 (O&M)

State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

11. Ordered accordingly.

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

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

**(SUMEET GOEL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 29, 2025**

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No