

2025:PHHC:161553



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.26524 of 2025
Date of Decision: 20.11.2025
Reserved on: 13.11.2025

Sukhraj Singh ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

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

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
06	21.01.2025	City-2 Mansa, District Mansa	21 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short ‘NDPS Act’) (21(c), 27 and 29 of NDPS Act added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on 21.01.2025, the accused Babandeep Singh @ Babbu @ Mal Singh and Balkar Singh @ Poppy were apprehended on the basis of suspicion and 50 grams of heroin was recovered from their conscious possession. They suffered disclosure

2025:PHHC:161553



statements on the basis of which the accused Gursewak Singh was nominated as additional accused. He was arrested on 24.01.2025. Recovery of 1 kg 700 grams of heroin and drug money of Rs.5,40,000/- was recovered from his conscious possession. Offence under Section 29 of NDPS Act was added. On the basis of disclosure statement suffered by the accused Gursewak Singh, the present petitioner was nominated as additional accused since it was disclosed by Gursewak Singh that the drug money was to be taken by the petitioner from him. The petitioner was arrested on 24.01.2025 and 150 grams of heroin was recovered from him qua which a separate FIR No.02 had been registered against him at Police Station Sadar Budhlada on the same day. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of Gursewak Singh which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. No recovery has been effected from him in this case. He had no connection with the recovery allegedly effected from the co-accused. He is in custody since 06.02.2025. The co-accused Babandeep Singh and Balkar Singh have been extended benefit of bail. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as only 02 out of 21 witnesses have been examined. His involvement in other two cases cannot be considered to be a ground for denying benefit of bail to him. Moreso, he is on bail in one of those two cases. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

2025:PHHC:161553



4. Per contra learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argue that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The well settled proposition of law is that the Court while considering an application for grant of bail has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a prima facie case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment in the event of conviction; the danger of accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail and reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened. The period of incarceration is also relevant fact that is to be considered. It is also unequivocally established that, to be granted bail, the accused charged with offence under the provisions of NDPS Act must fulfill the conditions stipulated in Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

7. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the co-accused Gursewak Singh whose name was disclosed by accused Babandeep Singh @ Babbu @ Mal Singh and Balkar Singh @ Poppy, from whom recovery of contraband has been effected. As per his disclosure statement, he had sourced the contraband from the petitioner. In ***Tofan Singh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1***, it was observed by

Hon'ble Apex Court that the disclosure statements made under Section 67 of

2025:PHHC:161553



NDPS Act, are inadmissible in evidence unless corroborated by independent material. While the veracity of the disclosure statement against the petitioner will be tested during the course of trial, however, at this stage, it cannot be ignored that no recovery was ever effected from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 06.02.2025. Challan has been presented. The trial will take time. The object of jail is to secure the appearance of the accused during the trial and it can neither be punitive nor preventive and the deprivation of liberty has been considered as a punishment. As per the discussion made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned and on the following conditions:-

- (i) the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner whatsoever.
- (ii) he shall not leave the country under any circumstance without permission of the learned trial Court.
- (iii) he shall appear before the learned trial Court as and when directed.
- (iv) he shall provide his address where he would be residing

2025:PHHC:161553



after release and shall not change the same without informing the concerned IO/SHO.

(v) the petitioner shall upon his release give his mobile phone number to concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switch on all times.

8. In the event of there being any FIR/complaint lodged against the petitioner, it shall be open to the respondent to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

20.11.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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