



CRM-M-6525-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-6525-2025
Decided on : 14.10.2025

PARAMJEET SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Vishal Deep Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Paramjeet Singh	143	15.07.2019	21, 22, 29 of NDPS Act	Sultanpur Lodhi	Kapurthala

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, as per the allegations, on 15.07.2019, petitioner, while driving a Scorpio car, bearing registration No.PB 65L 2655, was intercepted by members of the police team. Upon interception, petitioner – Paramjeet Singh, was allegedly found in possession of 260 grams of an intoxicated powder. Co-



accused Ajay Kumar @ Ajay was found with 270 grams of an intoxicating substance, while another co-accused, Amandeep Singh, was allegedly found in possession of 500 grams of heroin.

3. It is submitted that petitioner was arrested on 15.07.2019 and was thereafter granted interim bail on 26.09.2019. However, despite subsequent receipt of the FSL report confirming the substance recovered from the petitioner to be alprazolam, weighing 260 grams, petitioner failed to appear before the Investigating Agency or learned Trial Court. Nevertheless, petitioner voluntarily surrendered on 24.04.2024 and has since remained in custody for over 1 year and 5 months.

Further submits that petitioner has remained in custody for a total period of 1 year and 8 months in connection with the alleged recovery of 260 grams of alprazolam, which falls under the category of commercial quantity, exceeding the non-commercial threshold of 100 grams, as prescribed under the NDPS Act.

4. It is argued that despite the petitioner being incarcerated for such a prolonged duration, trial is not progressing at the requisite pace. Furthermore, petitioner is stated to be the sole breadwinner of his family, having two minor daughters who are entirely dependent upon him. It is also submitted that petitioner is not a habitual offender and has never been involved in any other offence under the NDPS Act. In view of these circumstances, counsel prays that a sympathetic view be taken and petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel is unable to dispute any of the factual assertions made by learned counsel for the petitioner



during the course of arguments before this Court, including the fact that petitioner has undergone a total incarceration period of approximately 1 year and 8 months.

6. On being asked by the Court, learned State counsel fairly submits that petitioner, aged about 44 years, has not been found to be involved in any other similar offence under the provisions of the NDPS Act.

7. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the material available on record.

8. Taking into account the total period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, coupled with the fact that he is father of two minor children who are entirely dependent upon him, and he is a first-time offender with no previous involvement in any other case under the NDPS Act, this Court is of the considered view that a case is made out for grant of regular bail. The allegations against the petitioner are yet to be established during the course of trial. In these circumstances, and by taking a sympathetic view of the matter, this Court deems it just and appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.



CRM-M-6525-2025

4

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

14.10.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO