



CRM-M-41613 of 2025

-1-

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

220

CRM-M-41613 of 2025

Date of Decision: 11.09.2025

Mukand Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India through Narcotic Control Bureau
Chandigarh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHALPresent: Mr. Vikram Satpal Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr. Saurabh Goel, Advocate
for the respondent-NCB.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case NCB Crime No.12/2023 dated 06.06.2023 registered under Sections, 8, 18 and 23 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (charges framed under Section 18/23/29 of the NDPS Act), at Police Station Narcotics Control Bureau, Chandigarh.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that, on 06.06.2023, recovery of 0.057 kgs of opium had been effected from a courier parcel containing cloths which was concealed in the belt of a jeans in the form of four small packets. The petitioner is stated to be the consignor of said parcel.



CRM-M-41613 of 2025

-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 03.08.2024. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-NCB, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature and the petitioner was apprehended at the airport while trying to flee to Sharjah. He has further submitted that the petitioner is also involved in one more case meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

6. This Court is sanguine of the fact that according to the proposition settled by the Apex Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.



CRM-M-41613 of 2025

-3-

7. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 01 month; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges have also been framed, and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty



CRM-M-41613 of 2025

-4-

Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11.09.2025

D.Bansal

**(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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