



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

CRM-M-49527-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 10.09.2025

Inderjeet Singh @ Inderjit Singh @ Shera

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Monika Tanwar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-35517-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.104 dated 24.05.2025 under Sections 21(b), 27(A), 25, 61, 85 of NDPS, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act, added lateron), registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar.


2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the police party while on patrolling on 24.05.2025, saw a young man coming on motorcycle. On seeing the police, he got perplexed and turned his motorcycle towards the shed of bus stand. However, on suspicion he was stopped and on asking he disclosed his name as Lovepreet Singh. He was suspected to be carrying some contraband, thus, search was conducted by the police. On conducting the search of the motorcycle, two black coloured polythene bags were recovered from the seat of the motorcycle. On opening the same, heroin was recovered. On weighing, the same was found to be 10



grams of heroin. He failed to produce any licence regarding the possession of the same. Thus, on the registration of the FIR, the petitioner was arrested on the spot. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. The investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 08.08.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She submits that complicity of the petitioner surfaced in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Lovepreet Singh, from whom the alleged recovery has been effected. She has drawn the attention of this Court to order the order passed by this Court in **CRM-M-39520-2025** dated 30.07.2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lovepreet Singh, has been granted the concession of bail. She thus, submits that the case of the petitioner is on better footing than that of the co-accused. She submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is similar to that of the co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer of the petitioner and submits that the case is under investigation. He submits that name of the petitioner surfaced in the present case as he purchased the contraband from co-accused, namely, Lovepreet Singh, who has already



been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 30.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-39520-2025.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is inferred that name of the petitioner surfaced in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. The alleged recovery of 10 grams of heroin is a non-commercial quantity which has been effected from, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lovepreet Singh, who has already been granted bail by the Court vide order dated 30.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-39520-2025.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with the co-accused as stated above. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.09.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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