

2025:PHHC:148085



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

Date of decision: 29.10.2025

**CRM-M No.17329 of 2025 (O&M) -2-
CRM-M No.43361 of 2025;
CRM-M No.46743 of 2025
CRM-M No.48064 of 2025;
CRM-M No.57684 of 2025
CRM-M No.58010 of 2025**

2025.PHHC.148085



**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Kamaldip Singh Sidhu, Advocate with
 Ms. Kirandeep Kaur, Advocate
 for the petitioner in CRM-M-17329-2025.

Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-43361-2025.

Mr. Gursahib Singh Hundal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-46743 & 48064-2025.

Mr. J. S. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-57684-2025.

Ms. Nimisha, Advocate for
Mr. Harsh Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-58010-2025.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-41180-2025 in
CRM-M-17329-2025

Allowed as prayed for. Documents, Annexures P-6 to P-17
are ordered to be taken on record.

Main cases

1. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned six petitions
arising out of the same FIR.

2. All the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of
regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.19, dated
18.01.2025, under Sections 22/29/61/85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police
Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

CRM-M No.17329 of 2025 (O&M)
CRM-M No.43361 of 2025;
CRM-M No.46743 of 2025
CRM-M No.48064 of 2025;
CRM-M No.57684 of 2025
CRM-M No.58010 of 2025

-3-

2025.PHHC:148085



3. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the police party, while on patrolling on 18.01.2025, received a secret information to the effect that Laddi Singh @ Laddi was involved in selling the intoxicant tablets. It was informed that he was present near the vacant plot situated on the backside of Dadu Motors, Barnala and in case of raid, he could be arrested along with the contraband. On receiving the secret information, the raiding party was constituted and reached the place as disclosed. On reaching the place, the person, as disclosed in the secret information, was found and thus was apprehended. On asking, he disclosed his name to be Laddi Singh @ Laddi. He was suspected to be carrying some contraband and thus, his search was conducted. On conducting the search, 02 boxes were recovered. However, on conducting the search of 02 boxes, 11000 intoxicant tablets of Carisoprodol and 9000 intoxicant tablets of Tramadol, i.e. total 20000 intoxicant tablets were recovered. He failed to produce any licence regarding the conscious possession of the same and thus, the FIR was registered and he was arrested on the spot. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. As per the FSL, 9000 tablets recovered weighed 3.348 Kgs. During the investigation on 20.01.2025, Laddi Singh @ Laddi made a disclosure statement about the complicity of Manjit Singh @ Kali Chidi, Jimmi Singh and Mamta and thus, they were arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, they all were arrested on 21.01.2025. Thereafter, on the statement recorded by Harpreet Singh on 20.01.2025,

CRM-M No.17329 of 2025 (O&M)
CRM-M No.43361 of 2025;
CRM-M No.46743 of 2025
CRM-M No.48064 of 2025;
CRM-M No.57684 of 2025
CRM-M No.58010 of 2025

-4-

2025.PHHC.148085



complicity of Robin, Ramandeep and Mandeep has been established and thus, they were also arrayed as an accused in the present case and were arrested on 20.01.2025. All the petitioners approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Barnala praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge, Barnala declined all the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide orders dated 07.03.2025, 18.03.2025, 22.04.2025, 08.05.2025 and 18.06.2025, respectively. Being aggrieved, the petitioners, namely, Robin Bansal, Ramandeep Singh @ Ramma @ Ramna and Manjeet Singh @ Kali Chidi (in CRM-M-46743-2025; CRM-M-48064-2025 and CRM-M-58010-2025, respectively) earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-32040-2025, CRM-M-32740-2025 and CRM-M-35232-2025, however the same were dismissed vide orders dated 18.06.2025, 08.07.2025 and 11.07.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions praying for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They have submitted that it is evident from the case of prosecution that the alleged recovery has been effected from the co-accused, namely, Laddi Singh @ Laddi and the petitioners have been arrayed as an accused in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, wherein it has been alleged that the petitioners were the purchasers of the

CRM-M No.17329 of 2025 (O&M)
CRM-M No.43361 of 2025;
CRM-M No.46743 of 2025
CRM-M No.48064 of 2025;
CRM-M No.57684 of 2025
CRM-M No.58010 of 2025

-5-

2025.PHHC.148085



alleged recovery of contraband. They have submitted that the disclosure statement in itself is not even an admissible evidence. They have submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, i.e. 20.01.2025 and 21.01.2025. They have submitted that though the petitioners are involved in other cases, however they are on bail. They have submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the recovery effected from the co-accused, namely, Laddi Singh @ Laddi is a commercial quantity and thus, the provisions of Section 37 of NDPS Act are attracted. He has submitted that the investigation is complete and charges have been framed. He, on instructions has submitted that out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has produced custody certificates of the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.

6. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

7. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, it is deciphered that the recovery in the present case though a commercial quantity but was effected from the co-accused, namely, Laddi Singh @ Laddi. The petitioners have been arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. No witness has been

CRM-M No.17329 of 2025 (O&M)
CRM-M No.43361 of 2025;
CRM-M No.46743 of 2025
CRM-M No.48064 of 2025;
CRM-M No.57684 of 2025
CRM-M No.58010 of 2025

-6-

2025.PHHC.148085



examined, out of total 19 prosecution witnesses. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioners have suffered incarceration of 09 months and 05 days, 09 months and 06 days and 09 months and 07 days as on 28/29.10.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Jimmi Singh (in CRM-M-43361-2025) is not involved in any other case whereas the petitioner, namely, Mamta (in CRM-M-17329-2025) is involved in two cases, however she is on bail in those cases. The petitioner, namely, Robin Bansal (in CRM-M-46743-2025) is involved in 04 other cases, however in two of the cases, he is on bail and in one case, he has been acquitted and in one case, he is on probation. The petitioner, namely, Ramandeep Singh Shammi (in CRM-M-48064-2025) is also involved in 04 other cases, however in 2 of the cases, he is on bail and in one case, he has been acquitted and the petitioner, namely, Mandeep Singh (CRM-M-57684-2025) is involved in 09 other cases, however in one of the case, he is on bail, in 02 of the cases, he has undergone the sentence and in 05 of the cases, he has been acquitted. Petitioner, namely, Manjeet Singh @ Kali Chidi is involved in 03 other case, however two of the cases, he is on bail and in one case, he has been acquitted.

8. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court cannot ignore the fact that the speedy trial is the fundamental right of every accused. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Mohd Muslim @ Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 LiveLaw(SC)260,** this Court is of the opinion that the case of the petitioner is covered by the

CRM-M No.17329 of 2025 (O&M)
CRM-M No.43361 of 2025;
CRM-M No.46743 of 2025
CRM-M No.48064 of 2025;
CRM-M No.57684 of 2025
CRM-M No.58010 of 2025

-7-

2025.PHHC.148085



ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In the abovesaid case Hon'ble Supreme Court expressed its views as under:-

19. A plain and literal interpretation of the conditions under Section 37 (i.e., that Court should be satisfied that the accused is not guilty and would not commit any offence) would effectively exclude grant of bail altogether, resulting in punitive detention and unsanctioned preventive detention as well. Therefore, the only manner in which such special conditions as enacted under Section 37 can be considered within constitutional parameters is where the court is reasonably satisfied on a prima facie look at the material on record (whenever the bail application is made) that the accused is not guilty. Any other interpretation, would result in complete denial of the bail to a person accused of offences such as those enacted under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

20. xxxxx

21.it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable.

22. xxxxx

23. There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, "as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal"²² (also see Donald Clemmer's 'The Prison Community' published in 1940²³). Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these



aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials – especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up and concluded speedily.”

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.
10. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, all the petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. However, if the petitioner, namely, Ramandeep Singh @ Ramma @ Ramna (in CRM-M-48064-2025) does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

29.10.2025

rittu

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE