



CRM-M-6619-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-6619-2025

Date of decision: 18.11.2025

JASKARAN @ JASSI

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Fariad Singh Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, Special Public Prosecutor with
Mr. Harneesh Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2-NCB.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case of NCB Crime No.12 dated 06.06.2024 under Sections 8, 18, 23 and 29 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station NCB, Chandigarh.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case is that on 06.06.2024, the Intelligence was received regarding one Courier parcel bearing AWB No. 7157715224 lying at DHL Express Limited which has been booked by one Rahul Sharma. On receiving the secret information, the Investigating Agencies took action and reached the place from where the parcel was booked. A notice under Section 67 of NDPS Act was served upon one Mukesh Kumar, Manager of the said Eagle International Courier Services and his statement was recorded and he disclosed that the parcel was not booked by Rahul Sharma but by one Ajay Kumar. Thus, a notice under Section 67 of the NDPS Act was served on Ajay Kumar, who stated that he had not booked any such parcel and that he had been on duty on

**CRM-M-6619-2025****-2-**

03.06.2024. Thereafter, on 24.06.2024, the second disclosure of Mukesh Kumar was recorded who revealed the name of one Gurvir Singh. The Investigating Agencies recorded the statement of one Pradeep Kumar, the Manager of the said Punjab International Courier Services. During this whole process, total of two parcels were intercepted, and from one parcel, 1.245 kg of opium was recovered, while the second parcel yielded 1.955 kg of opium, amounting to a total recovery of 3.2 kg of opium from the two parcels was effected. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioner and surfaced thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case and was arrested on 28.06.2024. On the completion of the investigation, challan stands presented, charges have been framed and trial had commenced. Petitioner approached the Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana declined the bail application vide order dated 10.10.2024. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Manjit Singh and Baljinder Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 14.11.2025, passed in CRM-M-7848-2025 and CRM-M-15774-2025, whereby, co-accused Manjit Singh and Baljinder Singh have been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since 28.06.2024. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the

**CRM-M-6619-2025****-3-**

is at par with the co-accused, namely, Manjit Singh and Baljinder Singh. However, he further submits that the petitioner used his Aadhaar card to book parcels for sending them abroad. On instructions, he has submitted that out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, 10 have been examined and 01 has been given up. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 28.06.2024. Co-accused, namely, Manjit Singh and Baljinder Singh are on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with them. As submitted before this Court, the petitioner has completed incarceration of about 1 year and 04 months and 15 days and he is not involved in any other case. Out of 25 prosecution witnesses, 10 have been examined and 01 has been given up.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18.11.2025
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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