



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

Date of decision: 01.09.2025

1. CRM-M-12880-2025

KARAM SINGH @ NIMMA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-23918-2025

ANMOLPREET SINGH @ ANMOL SINGH @ ANMOL @ MOLA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-12880-2025.

Mr. A. S. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-23918-2025.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of two petitions i.e. CRM-M-12880-2025 and CRM-M-23918-2025, as the same have emanated out of the same occurrence.
2. These petitions have been filed by Karam Singh @ Nimma (petitioner in CRM-M-12880-2025) and Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol @ Anmol @ Mola (petitioner in CRM-M-23918-2025), under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), seeking grant of regular bail to the them, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First

Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Karam Singh @ Nimma	16	01.03.2024	21 of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on)	Kulgari	Ferozepur , Punjab
Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol @ Anmol Mola	16	01.03.2024	21 of NDPS Act (Sections 25 and 29 of NDPS Act added later on)	Kulgari	Ferozepur , Punjab

The said FIR was initially registered under Section 21 of the NDPS Act, against 1) Heera Singh and 2) Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol @ Anmol @ Mola. Subsequently, on the basis of disclosure statement of Heera Singh, Gurjeet Singh was nominated as accused vide GD No.9 dated 03.03.2024, and Section 29 of NDPS Act was also added. Still further, during trial and after filing of an application under Section 358 of BNSS by the prosecution, offence under Section 25 of NDPS Act was also added against one Bachhitar Singh, being owner of vehicle bearing No.PB-05-AR-1927.

2. As per allegations, petitioner Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol Singh @ Anmol @ Mola and co-accused-Hira Singh were travelling together in a car bearing registration No.PB-05-AR-1927 towards Ferozepur city. They both were intercepted by the patrolling team and from their possession 1.500 kg of heroin was recovered. Further, the case developed by the prosecution is that 1.450 kg of heroin was recovered from the cloth which was wrapped by accused-Hira Singh



- 3-

with his waist, whereas, 50 grams was recovered from the right side pocket of the pant worn by petitioner-Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol Singh @ Anmol @ Mola.

The name of petitioner- Karam Singh @ Nimma has surfaced in the disclosure statement dated 03.03.2024, i.e. after two days of registration of FIR, of co-accused Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol Singh @ Anmol @ Mola (petitioner in CRM-M-23918-2025), and the allegation against Karam Singh @ Nimma is that he had supplied 50 grams of heroin to some unknown persons.

3. Mr. J.S. Sandhu, learned counsel for petitioner- Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol Singh @ Anmol @ Mola, contends that in fact the total recovery of 1.500 kg of heroin was effected from the cloth wrapped by main accused-Hira Singh. But only with a view to implead the petitioner Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol Singh @ Anmol @ Mola in the crime, recovery of 50 grams of heroin has been shown to be have been recovered from the right side pocket of the pant worn by him. Completely a false case has been registered *qua* him because he is already known to the police officials on account of his involvement in one other case of NDPS Act.

Mr. J.S. Sandhu further contends that, considering the manner of recovery, the burden will be heavily on the prosecution to prove whether the contraband recovered from the cloth wrapped around the waist of Hira Singh can make the petitioner (Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol Singh @ Anmol @ Mola) liable or not, unless there is complete knowledge on the part of the petitioner. It cannot be said that he had any conscious possession of the contraband, which was in the exclusive possession of the main accused-Hira Singh.

He also contends that if recovery of 50 grams of heroin from the



- 4-

petitioner is taken to be true, the quantity recovered is less than the maximum of non-commercial quantity, i.e., 250 grams.

He further contends that Co-accused Gurjit Singh against whom there are allegations of supplying the contraband to main accused, has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court, vide order dated 11.08.2025, passed in CRM-M-42567-2025.

Mr. A.S. Mann, learned counsel for the petitioner-Karam Singh @ Nimma additionally contends that except of the disclosure statement against Karam Singh @ Nimma (petitioner in CRM-M-12880-2025) there is no substantial evidence with the prosecution. It is heavily upon the prosecution to prove the charges, as disclosure statement is a weak kind of evidence and the conviction cannot be made on such kind of evidence.

Thus, learned counsel for the petitioners pray for grant of regular bail.

3. Status report dated 31.08.2025 by way of an affidavit of Mr. Manjit Singh, PPS, Superintendent of Police (Inv) Ferozepur, District Ferozepur has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same is taken on record.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer of grant of bail to the petitioners, keeping in view the nature of allegations and the gravity of offence involved herein. He further submits that out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined and petitioner- Anmolpreet Singh @ Anmol Singh @ Anmol @ Mola is involved in one more case of similar nature, in which he has undergone the sentence period awarded to him. Thus, prays for dismissal of the present petitions.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant



- 5-

material available on record with their able assistance.

6. As per totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioners, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

9. Both the petitions stand disposed of.

10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

01.09.2025
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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