

2025:PHHC:096381



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

228

**CRM-M-19393-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 31.07.2025**

**Sandeep Singh**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant one is the second petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 103, dated 13.08.2024, registered under Sections 21(C), 25 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station Dugri, District Ludhiana. The previous petition, bearing number **CRM-M-53738-2024**, was dismissed as withdrawn on 09.01.2025.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the allegations that on 13.08.2024, on the basis of secret information, co-accused

2025:PHHC:096381



Jasjot Singh @ Jot and Khushmandar Singh @ Mandar were apprehended by a police party while they were coming on a scooter bearing registration number PB-10-JC-4192. On conducting search, recovery of 21000 tablets of Alprazole 0.5 (Alprazolam) along with drug money of Rs. 15,050/- was effected from them. Since they could not produce any valid license or permit to keep in their possession the recovered drug, they were formally arrested at the spot. Upon interrogation, they nominated one Savita Garg, her son Deepak Garg and the present petitioner as the persons, who were supplying intoxicant tablets to them. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was nominated in this case as an accused and was arrested on 13.08.2024. At his instance, recovery of 600 tablets of Alprazole 0.5 NRx (Alprazolam) was effected. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, *challan* was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was neither named in the FIR nor was found at the spot. He has been nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. He is not involved in any other case. Subsequent recovery was in fact planted upon him. Even otherwise, investigation stands completed and *challan* has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time. The petitioner is in custody since 13.08.2024. No useful purpose would be served by keeping

2025:PHHC:096381



him in custody anymore. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. It is, thus, urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with co-accused Deepak Garg and Savita Garg is alleged to be involved in the business of selling intoxicant tablets to co-accused. Recovery of 21000 tablets of Alprazolam has been effected from the co-accused, whereas 600 tablets of the same salt have been recovered from the present petitioner. The allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. Investigation has since been completed and *challan* has been filed. Trial is going on and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of trial. The apprehension expressed by learned State counsel that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond or indulge in similar offences, can also not be ignored at this stage. Therefore, keeping in view the gravity of allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the quantity of alleged contraband recovered in this case, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that he does not deserve to be

2025:PHHC:096381



granted concession of regular bail, at this stage. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

**31.07.2025**

*Wassem Ansari*

**(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable*

*Yes/No  
Yes/No*