



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-36218-2025
Date of decision: 23.09.2025

CHAMKAUR SINGH ALIAS CHANNA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Bikramjeet Singh Jatana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 0167 dated 04.11.2024 registered under Sections 103, 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 27 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (added later on) at Police Station Jhunir, District Mansa.

2. The present case was registered on the basis of the statement of the complainant, Jagtar Singh, who alleged that on 02.11.2024, his son Harpreet Singh was taken on a motorcycle by Kuldeep Singh and did not return thereafter. Subsequently, the dead body of Harpreet Singh was recovered from a room in the park situated at Village Sahnewali. It is further alleged that the cause of death of Harpreet Singh was the administration of a

**CRM-M-36218-2025**

-2-

drug overdose by Kuldeep Singh in concert with his brother. The motive attributed to the incident is that an earlier altercation had taken place between Harpreet Singh and Sandeep Singh @ Kalu, pursuant whereunto Sandeep Singh @ Kalu, along with his brother, conspired to commit the murder of Harpreet Singh. During the course of interrogation of accused Gurjeewan Singh, it was revealed that the drugs in question had been supplied by accused Chamkaur Singh @ Channa. On the basis of this disclosure, the applicant/accused came to be nominated in the present case.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case of the prosecution, initially two suspects were nominated by the complainant who is father of deceased -Harpreet Singh. The said suspects were Kuldeep Singh and Sandeep Singh. During the investigation Sandeep Singh was found innocent. He thus submits that as per the investigation, the deceased Harpreet Singh was accompanied by Kuldip Singh and Gurjeevan Singh and they had come to the village of the petitioner to pick him up. As per the disclosure of Kuldeep Singh, Gurjeevan Singh had purchased the drug from the petitioner and that on account of an overdose of the same, Harpreet Singh died. It is argued by the learned Counsel that the petitioner had neither met the deceased nor had any dispute whatsoever with him. Furthermore, no recovery was effected from the petitioner in the said case. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is complete and the final report has been filed on 03.02.2025. The petitioner has undergone an actual custody of nearly 07 months. It is submitted that no witnesses out of a total 29 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

**CRM-M-36218-2025**

-3-

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that the petitioner was nominated as an accused in two other cases of the NDPS Act. The rest of the contents are however not disputed.

5. Responding to the above, Counsel for the petitioner contends that the one of the case is registered under Section 27 of the NDPS Act and the petitioner has been granted the concession of bail in the said case. The second offence is under Section 29 of the NDPS Act and pertains to possession of 03 grams of Heroin and the same being small quantity, the petitioner already stands released.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

7. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the role attributed to the petitioner, the lack of recovery, the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner as well as the stage of trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

8. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.



CRM-M-36218-2025

-4-

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

SEPTEMBER 23, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No