



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-46573-2025
Decided on : 19.11.2025

Sukhdev Singh @ Rana . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Gurpreet S. Gurna, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sukhdev Singh @ Rana	94	04.07.2025	21, 27-A, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, 1985	Chattiwind	Amritsar Rural

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the FIR, on 04.07.2025 at about 7:00–8:00 PM, near the bridge over the drain at the outskirts of village Mehma, within the jurisdiction of Police Station Chattiwind, District Amritsar Rural, the main accused – Manikaran Singh alias Money – was apprehended and a recovery of 10 grams of heroin along with ₹300/- as alleged drug money was effected from his possession. It is further alleged that, during interrogation, the said accused made a disclosure statement that he had purchased the recovered contraband from Sukhdev Singh alias Rana Singh (petitioner herein) and Monty alias



Motty alias Manpreet Singh.

3. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which by itself is a weak evidence and inadmissible in law, unless supported by independent recovery or corroborative material. No contraband whatsoever has been recovered from the petitioner. Petitioner is in custody since 05.07.2025, and is a person who has otherwise been law-abiding. It is further submitted that the petitioner is facing one more case under the NDPS Act, i.e., FIR No. 31, dated 03.03.2023, under Sections 22 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Chatwind, said case also pertaining to non-commercial quantity. Hence, his past antecedents cannot be said to be of such nature as to disentitle him from bail.

4. Learned counsel further submits that co-accused Manikaran Singh @ Money, from whose possession the contraband was actually recovered, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 13.10.2025, passed in CRM-M-55802-2025, titled "*Manikaran Singh @ Money v. State of Punjab*". Besides, similarly situated co-accused – Monty alias Motty alias Manpreet Singh, has also been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 12.11.2025, passed in CRM-M-62374-2025, titled as, "*Monty alias Motty alias Manpreet Singh v. State of Punjab*". In support of his contention, learned counsel places copies of the orders in Court, which are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

Accordingly, on the ground of parity, as well as keeping in view that the petitioner's implication rests solely on the disclosure statement of



the co-accused and no recovery has been effected from him, it is prayed that the petitioner also deserves to be extended the same benefit of regular bail.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has been named on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused Manikaran Singh @ Money, from whose possession 10 grams of heroin along with drug money of Rs.300 was recovered.

However, learned State counsel candidly admits that no recovery of any narcotic contraband has been effected from the petitioner, and his implication rests solely upon the disclosure statement of the co-accused. Besides, other factual assertions as noticed here-above have not been disputed by learned State counsel.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material on record, it is evident that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner, and his name has surfaced only in the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which by itself is a weak and inadmissible piece of evidence, unless corroborated through independent material. The main accused, from whose possession the actual contraband was recovered, has already been enlarged on bail, and therefore, on the ground of parity also, the petitioner deserves similar consideration. Further, petitioner has already undergone incarceration for more than three months. The investigation stands concluded, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to reach its culmination. Considering, the fact that there is no recovery from him and similarly situated co-accused has already been granted concession of bail, this Court is inclined to extend him an opportunity to reform and rehabilitate himself in society rather than keeping him confined behind bars for an indefinite period during the trial.

In view of the totality of these circumstances, and the nature



allegations leveled against the petitioner, including the factors noticed here-above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner, so as to afford the petitioner an opportunity to reform and reintegrate himself in the society.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, 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.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 19, 2025

J.Ram

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