



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

233

**CRM-M-34530-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.07.2025**

Piara Singh @ Pyara Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate
with Mr. Ravinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0080 dated 15.05.2025 registered under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (in short 'the NDPS Act') (Section 29 of the NDPS Act, added later on) at Police Station Nihal Singh Wala, District Moga.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the police officials on receipt of a secret information intercepted a white colour Honda City car without registration number, in which one Jagmeet Singh was travelling and on search of the said vehicle, total 400 Kgs of Poppy Husk was recovered. Hence, the impugned FIR was registered and on the basis of disclosure statement made by Jagmeet Singh, Piara Singh @



Pyara Singh (petitioner herein) has been nominated as accused in the FIR (supra).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that admittedly, the petitioner was not named in the FIR and the alleged recovery of Poppy Husk is effected from co-accused Jagmeet Singh. There is no evidence to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence and the petitioner has been nominated in the case solely on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused during his custodial interrogation and such statement recorded by a police officer under Section 67 of the NDPS Act has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law as the same is hit by Sections 25 and 26 of the Evidence Act. Apart from the disclosure statement made by co-accused, there is no other evidence against the petitioner and the trial is likely to take long time in conclusion.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate today in the Court which is taken on record and he opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has been specifically named by the co-accused and the petitioner is involved in other cases also, however, he could not controvert the fact that the petitioner is in custody from the last 01 month and 20 days.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case, it transpires that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last 01 month and 20 days. Investigation is complete.



The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court. Charges were framed and trial of the case has not made much progress.

7. A two Judge Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court in "***Satender Kumar Antil vs. CBI***", (2022) 10 SCC 51, with respect to prevailing conditions of undertrial prisoner in India has observed:

"6. Jails in India are flooded with undertrial prisoners. The statistics placed before us would indicate that more than 2/3rd of the inmates of the prisons constitute undertrial prisoners. Of this category of prisoners, majority may not even be required to be arrested despite registration of a cognizable offence, being charged with offences punishable for seven years or less. They are not only poor and illiterate but also would include women. Thus, there is a culture of offence being inherited by many of them. As observed by this Court, it certainly exhibits the mindset, a vestige of colonial India, on the part of the investigating agency, notwithstanding the fact arrest is a draconian measure resulting in curtailment of liberty, and thus to be used sparingly. In a democracy, there can never be an impression that it is a police State as both are conceptually opposite to each other."

8. Further the culpability, if any, would be determined at the time of trial and as such, no useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner-accused. 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. Further keeping in view the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in "*Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of U.P. and another*" 2020 (1) R.C.R. (Criminal 831) and "*Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and another*", 2012 (2) SCC 382, the involvement of the petitioner in other cases would not be a ground to refuse grant of concession of regular bail.

10. In view the discussion above, the present petition is allowed. Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petitioner namely Piara Singh @ Pyara Singh is ordered to be released on regular bail during pendency of the trial, on furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

11. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

10.07.2025

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No