



CRM-M-22520-2025

228

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

CRM-M-22520-2025

Decided on : 26.11.2025

Jagjit Singh alias Jagjeet alias Jagga

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of UT Chandigarh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP U.T. Chandigarh

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant second petition, under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.115 dated 28.07.2023 under Section 21 of NDPS Act (Sections 22, 27-A and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 and Section 25 of Arms Act added in challan) registered at Police Station South, Sector 34, Chandigarh.

2. First bail petition i.e. CRM-M-39987-2024 was disposed of as having been withdrawn at that stage vide order dated 19.11.2024 (Annexure P-5).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that after withdrawal of the first bail petition, co-accused Ravinder Pal Singh @ Ravi, vide order dated 19.03.2025, passed in CRM-M-57190-2024 (Annexure P-3), Chandan, vide order dated 12.11.2025, passed in CRM-M-9868-2025, Puneet Kumar, vide order dated 18.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-16766-2025, and Money Kalra, vide order dated 18.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-16483-2025, have been granted bail and, therefore,

**CRM-M-22520-2025**

petitioner, who is named in the disclosure statement of co-accused Ravinder Pal Singh @ Ravi, stands almost on the same footing, thus, entitled for the concession of regular bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that, infact the petitioner has not been named in the FIR, however, the allegation against him is that while he was inside jail, he was in regular contact with co-accused Ravinder Pal Singh @ Ravi, on mobile phone for the purpose of making required arrangements to procure the narcotic drugs/contraband. He further argues that, it is not the case of the prosecution that after arrest of Ravinder Pal Singh @ Ravi or even of petitioner, there exist evidence, establishing the regular contact between the two. Moreover, after arrest of the petitioner in the instant case, no recovery of any material has been effected. Thus, case of the prosecution relies solely on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which infact is an inadmissible evidence as has been settled many a times by the respective High Courts and the Hon'ble Apex Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that petitioner is inside the jail since 10.08.2023, i.e. for the last about 2 years and 3 months, and also submits that there being no material progress in the trial, final adjudication of the same is likely to take considerable time, therefore, personal liberty of the petitioner can not be curtailed for an indefinite period. Thus, prays for grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor submits that, infact, as per custody certificate, the petitioner is inside jail in the present case only for a period of 03 months and 22 days. By referring to the status report and chart wherein the other numerous cases registered against the petitioner have been explained, he further argues that the petitioner being habitual offender is not entitled for concession of regular bail.

**CRM-M-22520-2025**

4. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties. First bail petition of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn way back on 19.11.2024 i.e. a year back. As informed by learned Public Prosecutor, out of 34 prosecution witnesses, already four prosecution witnesses have been given up by it and process of recording of statements of the witnesses is yet to start. Admittedly, petitioner was lying inside the jail in other cases, when he was involved as accused in the present case on the basis of the disclosure statement of his co-accused Ravinder Pal Singh @ Ravi. It is also admitted position that neither any drug money has been recovered from his possession nor any narcotic drug or narcotic contraband has been found from his possession. The allegations, thus, are to be examined deeply by the trial Court after having complete set of evidence before it and burden to prove charges is also heavily upon the prosecution on the basis of some strong evidence apart the disclosure statement of co-accused, already relied upon by it. Other co-accused persons namely Ravinder Pal Singh @ Ravi, Chandan, Puneet Kumar and Money Kalra have already been released on regular bail by different orders by this Court.

5. Taking into consideration the circumstances in its entirety and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner and the facts noticed hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner, in the present case.

6. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds/two heavy local surety bonds each, to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and



CRM-M-22520-2025

shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereinabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts or merit 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.

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

November 26, 2025

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO