



254

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

CRM-M-8804-2025

Date of Decision:22.04.2025

Chamandeep Singh @ Chaman

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. L.S.Sekhon, Advocate and
Mr. Parshant, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.133 dated 29.12.2020 registered under Sections 22-C and 29 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Bhadaur, District Barnala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of a secret information against Inderjit Singh and Kulwinder Singh, co-accused and they were arrested by the police, while they were carrying 2000 tablets of tramadol. During the course of investigation, both the co-accused are alleged to have suffered their respective disclosure statements and named the petitioner as one of the accused. Learned counsel further contends that the police could not collect any other evidence, except the disclosure statements of the co-accused and the admissibility of such

a weak evidence is yet to be decided by the trial Court, during the course of trial. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 28.08.2024 and the challan has been presented against him.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that one more case was registered against the petitioner, however, he is on bail in the said case. Even the State counsel admits that Kulwinder Singh and Inderjit Singh, both main accused have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, the prosecution has alleged that Kulwinder Singh and Inderjit Singh were carrying 2000 tablets of tramadol and 900 other intoxicant tablets in their conscious possession, without any permit or license. However, both of them have already been admitted to bail vide orders (Annexures P-2 and P-3) passed by this Court. The petitioner is stated to have supplied narcotics to them, however, no recovery was effected from him.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

22.04.2025
hemlata

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