

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-17957-2025  
Date of decision: 07.05.2025

RAJINDER SINGH ALIAS PERRI ....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

| Name of<br>Petitioner(s)  | FIR<br>No. | Date       | Section(s)                                                                 | Police<br>Station | District              |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Rajinder<br>Singh @ Perri | 05         | 22.01.2024 | 21 of<br>NDPS Act<br>and<br>Section 29<br>of NDPS<br>Act added<br>later on | Arifke            | Ferozepur<br>, Punjab |

2. Recovery in the present case is from one Gurpreet Singh @ Guri. While a *naqa* was installed by the Police in the area of Police Station Arifke, District Ferozepur, Punjab, main accused Gurpreet Singh @ Guri, who was on motorcycle was stopped and thereon from his possession there was a recovery of



- 2-

1.550 Kg of heroin. On being asked by the police, he disclosed the name of co-accused namely Akashdeep Singh and said Akashdeep Singh also disclosed the name of present petitioner Rajinder Singh and co-accused Kulwant Singh @ Pippal @ Kala, from whom he received the contraband and in furtherance thereof, the recovered contraband was delivered to the main accused Gurpreet Singh @ Guri.

3. Counsel argues that solely on the basis of the disclosure statement and that too of the co-accused, chances of succeeding of the prosecution are almost nil. Investigation in the case is complete, but with the final report, no connecting evidence is available, to fortify the contents of disclosure statement.

4. It is also argued that the other co-accused namely Kulwant singh @ Pippal @ Kala, who was also named by another accused Akashdeep Singh has already been released on bail by this Court, vide order dated 21.02.2025 in CRM-M-5746-2025.

While producing the bail order with regard to accused Akashdeep Singh passed in CRM-M-52413-2024, counsel argues that said accused has also been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 10.01.2025. Counsel produces the copies of the said orders and same are taken on record.

5. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the grant of regular bail to the present petitioner, however, he confirms that petitioner is inside the jail since 25.01.2024. He also confirms the fact that out of the total 13 prosecution witnesses cited in the final report, only 04 prosecution witnesses have been examined till date.

6. In the totality of circumstances, coupled with the fact that other co-



- 3-

accused i.e. Akashdeep Singh and Kulwant Singh @ Pippal @ Kala, who are similarly situated with present petitioner, have already been released on bail by this Court and petitioner is inside the jail since 25.01.2024, also out of the total 13 prosecution witnesses cited in the final report, only 04 prosecution witnesses have been examined till date. The petitioner’s plea for grant of regular bail is worth considering, therefore, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his 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.

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

7. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

07.05.2025  
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

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