

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

2025:PHHC:157327



222

**CRM-M-33791-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.11.2025.**

Karan Khanna

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

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

Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.68 dated 17.04.2025, under Sections 21-B, 29, 27-A/61/85 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Chheharta, District Amritsar.

As per prosecution case, 80 grams of heroin and Rs.5,000/- drug money was recovered from the possession of co-accused Vikramjit Singh @ Dhony. The petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the said co-accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that no recovery had been effected from the petitioner and he is not connected with the offence in the present case. The petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He was nominated as an accused in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused

Vikramjit Singh @ Dhony, which is not admissible in law and as trial of the case is likely to take time, therefore, the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the petition and submitted that the petitioner is actively involved in the alleged offence. He has been specifically named in the disclosure statement of co-accused and as such he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations, the name of the petitioner surfaced in the present case, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Vikramjit Singh @ Dhony, who alleged that the petitioner is the supplier of the contraband. Except the disclosure statement, there is no material on record to connect the petitioner with the offence in question. Recovery had already been effected in the present case and now nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has already undergone custody of 06 months and 21 days. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time and no useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail, on furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of concerned learned trial Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

13.11.2025.

Komal

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