



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

250

CRM-M-40992-2025

Date of decision: 05.08.2025

KARANDEEP SINGH @ KANNU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

**Present:-** Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for  
Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.78 dated 25.04.2025 under Sections 21(B), 21(C), 29/61/85 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Chheharta, Amritsar City, District Amritsar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 10 grams of *Heroin* was recovered from the possession of one Akashdeep who nominated his brother Lovedeep Singh for being involved in sale of narcotics with him. On apprehension of Lovedeep Singh, he named Arshdeep Singh from whose possession 386 grams of *Heroin* was recovered. The present petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused-Arshdeep who stated that the recovered *Heroin* was to be supplied to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody for more than 03 months and he is not involved in any other case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.



6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing custody certificate dated 04.08.2025 vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the facts that the petitioner is in custody for 03 months and 02 days and has clean antecedents.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view of the above and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is around 03 months and 02 days and since apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to implicate the petitioner in the present case; conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, therefore further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. This Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on her furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during her bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

**05<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

*Sonia Puri*

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

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