



220

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

**CRM-M-51015-2024**

**Date of Decision:26.05.2025**

Sajan Masih

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**Coram :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

**Present :** Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate with  
Ms. Chandanpreet Kaur Ahluwalia, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the second petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.84 dated 08.09.2023 registered under Sections 21(c), 29, 27-A of NDPS Act and under Sections 379, 411, 489 of IPC, at Police Station Fatehgarh Churrian, District Gurdaspur. (offence under Section 27-A, 29 of NDPS Act and Section 489 IPC added later on).

2. As per case of the prosecution, on 08.09.2023, two young persons were intercepted by the police during patrolling duty, who were coming on motorcycle and they were apprehended on suspicion. On enquiry, they disclosed their names as Ranjit Singh and Sajan Masih. On search, 255 grams heroin alongwith drugs money of Rs.45,000/- was recovered from the accused Ranjit Singh and they were arrested.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case. He further submits that no recovery has been made from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 08.09.2023

and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. Trial is likely to take long time. 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. Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

**(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

**26.05.2025**  
hemlata

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