



CRM-M-26867-2025

-1-

254

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

CRM-M-26867-2025

Date of Decision: 21.05.2025

Manpreet Singh @ Mani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate and
Mr. Rajdeep Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present third petition praying for granting regular bail in a case FIR No.94 dated 09.03.2024 under Sections 22 and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and Section 482 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that on 09.03.2024, the Police party while on patrolling received a secret information to the effect that Vijay Kumar, Raju Singh, Darshan Singh @ Vicky and Jaswinder Singh @ Bhinder were involved in selling intoxicating tablets and they were waiting at Anaj Mandi, while standing nearby the trucks parked under the shed constructed at Anaj Mandi. If the raid is conducted, they could be arrested along with the contraband. On finding the information reliable, a raiding team was constituted and the place as disclosed was raided. All the four persons as disclosed above, were found present. On suspicion, they were given offer for search and on conducting the search of the bag, 410



intoxicating tablets were recovered from them. They failed to produce any licence regarding the possession of the same and thus were arrested on spot. The sample of the tablets was taken and then sent to the FSL. On receiving the FSL report, it was found to be containing 52.48 grams of Etizolam. On completion of investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of the charges, trial commenced. During investigation, the disclosure statement of the co-accused was recorded on 11.03.2024, and complicity of the petitioner was also mentioned and thus he was also arrayed as an accused on 11.03.2024. Subsequently, on completion of investigation, he was arrested on 19.04.2024. He approached the learned Judge, Special Court, Barnala, praying for the grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, learned same was declined on 21.05.2024. Being aggrieved, the petitioner approached earlier this Court twice by filing **CRM-M-27044 of 2024** and **CRM-M-64617-2024** but same were declined by this Court vide orders dated 21.08.2024 and 09.01.2025, respectively. Hence, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present third petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Kamal Krishan. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 12.05.2025 passed in **CRM-M-16699-2025**, whereby, co-accused Kamal Krishan, has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the case of the petitioner is at par with the said co-accused. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 19.04.2024. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has



CRM-M-26867-2025

-3-

already been granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State has also endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Kamal Krishan.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 19.04.2024. Co-accused, namely, Kamal Krishan, is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.05.2025

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No