

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39212-2025
Reserved on: 08.09.2025
Pronounced on: 30.09.2025

Yadwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
401	11.09.2023	Sadar Sirsa, District Sirsa	17 (c) of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 27(a), 29/61/85 added later on)

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. Per paragraph 11 of the bail petition, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply filed by the State. On 11-09-2023, based on prior information, the Police seized 5.5 kg of opium from the petitioner's possession. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements of the NDPS Act, 1985, and CrPC, 1973.
4. The petitioner's counsel seeks bail on the grounds of prolonged pretrial custody.
5. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.
6. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or

commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

7. The State’s counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

8. As per paragraph 2A of the reply, the name of the contraband is opium and its weight is 5kg and 500 grams.

9. Dealing in 5.5 kg of opium in contravention of the NDPS Act, 1985, constitutes an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

Substance Name	"Opium"
Quantity detained	5.5 Kg
Punishable U/s	S.18(c) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Commercial
Drug Quantity in % to upper limit of Intermediate	220.00%

Drug's Small & Commercial Qty. suggested by Committee report	
Notification No. & date	Expert Committee Report dated 24.03.1995 & 23.08.2001 (Small and Commercial)

<i>Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985</i>		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1055(E)	10/19/2001
Sr. No.	92	
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN))	Opium	
Other non-proprietary name	*****	
Chemical Name	And any preparation containing opium	
Small Quantity	< 25 Gram (i.e. equivalent to 0.025 Kg)	
Commercial Quantity	> 2500 Gram (i.e. equivalent to 2.5 Kg)	

0

Declared as punishable under NDPS Act and as per schedule defined in S.2(xi) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985
--

Notification No. & dated	S.18 & S.2(xv) NDPS Act, S.O.821(E)	11/14/1985
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------

Sr. No.	S.2(xv)
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	*****
Other non-proprietary name	*****
Chemical Name	<p>S.2(xv) “opium” means—</p> <p>(a) the coagulated juice of the opium poppy; and</p> <p>(b) any mixture, with or without any neutral material, of the coagulated juice of the opium poppy,</p> <p>but does not include any preparation containing not more than 0.2 per cent. of morphine; S.2 (xvii) “opium poppy” means—</p> <p>(a) the plant of the species <i>Papaver somniferum</i> L; and</p> <p>(b) the plant of any other species of <i>Papaver</i> from which opium or any phenanthrene alkaloid can be extracted and which the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, declare to be opium poppy for the purposes of this Act;</p> <p>Explanation.-- For the purposes of clauses (v) (vi), (xv) and (xvi) the percentages in the case of liquid preparations shall be calculated on the basis that</p> <p>a preparation containing one per cent. of a substance means a preparation in which one gram of substance, if solid, or one millilitre of substance, if liquid, is contained in every one hundred millilitre of the preparation and so on in proportion for any greater or less percentage:</p> <p>Provided that the Central Government may, having regard to the developments in the field of methods of calculating percentages in liquid preparations prescribed, by rules, any other basis which it may deem appropriate for such calculation.</p>

10. The quantity allegedly involved in this case is commercial. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case. The petitioner must satisfy the twin

conditions set forth by the Legislature under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

11. Per the custody certificate dated 05.09.2025, the petitioner's custody in this FIR is of 01 year, 11 months and 16 days.

12. The prolonged incarceration, generally militates against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and in such a situation, the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37(1)(b)(ii) of the NDPS Act¹.

13. The petitioner is entitled to bail because, in somewhat similar cases where the quantity involved was either greater than or close to the amount seized in the current FIR, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has granted bail after prolonged custody, as demonstrated by the following judicial precedent.

14. In *Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal*, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

[2]. The allegations are that upon receipt of a secret information, the police conducted a raid in which the petitioner and the co-accused Rabiul Alam were arrested and 4 kgs., 920 gms of opium latex was seized.

[4]. It is not in dispute that after filing of chargesheet and framing of charges, the trial has commenced but only examination-in-chief of P.W.1 has been completed. However, there are 12 witnesses, who are proposed to be examined by the prosecution.

[5]. It may be mentioned that the High Court while declining bail to the petitioner has directed for conclusion of trial within one year. But it seems that regardless thereto, the trial has not been expedited as no effective hearing took place for the last 2/3 dates. That being so, the conclusion of trial is likely to take some reasonable time. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents. He has already spent one year and six months in custody. The continued incarceration of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

[6]. Taking into consideration the period spent by the petitioner in custody and the fact that the petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents, we are satisfied that the conditions prescribed under Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be relaxed at this stage.

15. In *Miku Kumar Yadav v. The State of Jharkhand*, SLP (Crl.) No. 148-2025, decided on 07-04-2025, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

The petitioner is an accused for the offences punishable under Sections 414 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 18(b), 21(c), 22(c), and 29 of the NDPS Act. His bail application was rejected by the High Court vide impugned order dated 06.12.2024. He has already

¹ Supreme Court of India, in *Rabi Prakash v. The State of Odisha*, SLP (Crl) 4169-2023, Para 4, decided on 13 July 2023

undergone more than one year and six months in jail. The allegation against the petitioner is that 3 Kgs of opium was recovered from his possession.

Office Report dated 04.04.2025 indicates that the respondent - State has not filed appearance despite service of notice.

Considering the period of incarceration of the petitioner and the entire facts and circumstances of this case, we are of the opinion that a case of bail is made out for the petitioner and therefore, the prayer for bail is allowed.

16. Following the judicial precedent mentioned above, without commenting on the case's merits, and considering the petitioner's pre-trial custody, the weight of the drugs, coupled with the other factors peculiar to this case, further pre-trial incarceration is not justified at this stage. However, this order shall take effect from the time it is uploaded to this Court's official webpage.

17. Given the above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate or duty Magistrate, with or without sureties, with a maximum bond amount not to exceed INR 25,000.

18. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, the surety is capable of producing the accused. However, instead of surety, the petitioner may provide a fixed deposit of INR 25,000/-, with a clause that the interest shall not be accumulated in FD, either drawn from a State-owned bank or any bank listed on the National Stock Exchange and/or Bombay Stock Exchange, in favour of the "Chief Judicial Magistrate" of the concerned Sessions Division; or a fixed deposit made in the name of the petitioner, with similar terms and with endorsement from the banker stating that the FD shall not be encumbered or redeemed without the permission of the concerned trial Court, or until the surety bond has been discharged.

19. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.
3.	Mobile number (If available)
4.	E-Mail id (If available)

20. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

21. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and

circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

22. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the detection squad, members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of release from prison and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

23. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense and also to block the menace of drug abuse. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

24. In *Md. Tajjur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal*, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, the Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

25. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

26. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or

commercial, or violates S. 19, 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

27. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

28. In Amit Rana v. State of Haryana, CRM-18469-2025 [in CRA-D-123-2020, decided on 05.08.2025], a Division Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court in paragraph 13, holds that “To ensure that every person in judicial custody who has been granted bail or whose sentence has been suspended gets back their liberty without any delay, it is appropriate that whenever the bail order or the orders of suspension of sentence are not immediately sent by the Registry, computer systems, or Public Prosecutor, then in such a situation, to facilitate the immediate restoration of the liberty granted by any Court, the downloaded copies of all such orders, subject to verification, must be accepted by the Court before whom the bail bonds are furnished.”

29. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

30.09.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.