



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

245

CRM-M-24691 of 2025  
Date of decision: 24.07.2025

Harpreet Singh @ Haria

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Sachin Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. H. S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.96 dated 22.06.2024, under Sections 21, 25 and 29 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station STF Mohali, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

2. As per case of the prosecution is that 1 Kg. of heroin was recovered from three persons. A secret information was received by the informer that petitioner was a kingpin and operating the business/ smuggling of heroin from behind the bars. It is stated that at the time of recovery of contraband, the petitioner was in custody in another FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case as there is no corroborative evidence on record to connect the petitioner from the contraband so recovered in the present FIR. Petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 26 days as under trial in the present case. Trial is likely to take long time for its conclusion, therefore, petitioner be released on bail pending trial.



4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. H. S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the short reply of Kapil Kaushal, DSP, Anti Narcotics Task Force, Border Range, Amritsar, and the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 1 year and 26 days. He further submits that 9 more cases are pending against the petitioner in which 2 cases are under NDPS Act.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that trial is likely to take long time for its conclusion; the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of her bail.

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**24.07.2025**

anil

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