



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-44855-2024
Decided on : 09.01.2025

Parambir Singh @ Paramjit Singh @ Pamma

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Malkiat S. Hundal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep S. Samra, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner – Parambir Singh @ Paramjit Singh @ Pamma, who has been booked for having committed the offence punishable under Sections 21(c)/29/61/85 of the NDPS Act, 1985, in FIR No. 76, dated 01.05.2024, registered at Police Station Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran (Annexure P-1), during the pendency of trial.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that nothing has been recovered from the petitioner, rather, his name has been dragged in the present case only on the basis of alleged disclosure statement of co-accused namely; Kala Singh @ Kala, from whom 30 grams of heroine was recovered by the police.

3. Counsel further submits that petitioner is inside jail for the last about six months and the co-accused namely Kala Singh @ Kala, has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order



dated *07.01.2025*, passed in *CRM-M-53692-2024*, titled as, “*Kala Singh @ Kala vs. State of Punjab*”, and, in support of his contention, counsel for the petitioner has produced the copy of order, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

4. Counsel for the petitioner further argues that, according to the case built up by the prosecution through the disclosure statement, the petitioner was allegedly delivering 30 grams of heroin on an almost daily basis. However, in the absence of any recovery, this allegation appears to be false on its face. It is also submitted that no other case of a similar nature has ever been registered against the petitioner. Furthermore, the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future. Hence, counsel for the petitioner prays for the concession of regular bail.

5. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, files the status report dated 04.01.2025, by way of affidavit of Kamalmeet Singh, PPS, DSP, Sub-Division Tarn Taran, Distt. Tarn Taran, on behalf of the respondent – State, in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is the supplier of the contraband and can be considered the prime accused. However, he is unable to refute the factual submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner before this Court. He further does not dispute that the co-accused, ‘Kala Singh @ Kala’, has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 07.01.2025. It is also admitted that the petitioner is not



involved in any other case under the NDPS Act.

7. After hearing counsel for both the sides and the considering the submissions recorded here-in-above, and also examining the record available on the case file, I do find that it is a fit case for granting concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Consequently, the prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in this case, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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.

10. The observation made here-in-above 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 evidence available on record.

11. It is further made clear that if in future petitioner is found indulged in similar kind of activities, prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in the present case.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 09, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: Yes/~~No~~