



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

203

**CRM-M-4552-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.08.2025**

SHAMPY SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**Present:-** Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, seeking regular bail in FIR No.63 dated 10.04.2023 under Sections 21 and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Samana, (Sadar Samana) District Patiala.
2. The case of the prosecution is that a recovery of 1 kg of Heroin was effected from one Vipin Kumar who was arrested on the spot while he was coming in one Passat car alongwith one Sandeep Sharma who allegedly fled away. On the basis of disclosure statement of the said Vipin Kumar, the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to implicate the present petitioner in the said FIR. He further states that the present petitioner had moved a complaint bearing No.24 dated 29.05.2023 to the Vigilance Bureau



against the police officials which was investigated and thereupon FIR No.36 dated 23.10.2023 under Section 7 of P.C. Act, at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Patiala was registered against ASI-Raghubir Singh, to whom the petitioner had paid Rs. 6 lakhs for Inspector Vijay Kumar Incharge CIA Samana and thereafter, the petitioner was allowed to join investigation in FIR No.41/2023. It is stated that another amount of Rs.4 lakhs was demanded from the petitioner. He further states that in order to pressurise the petitioner, he has been involved in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 05 months and 15 days. He further submits that out of 24 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail. He does not refute the fact that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 05 months and 15 days and that out of 24 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. Keeping in view the custody period of the petitioner as an undertrial, that the custody undergone by the petitioner is 05 months and 15 days; out of 24 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial



Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

26th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No