



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

236

CRM-M-50753-2025
Decided on : 16.09.2025

Gurjit Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Karambir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, 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
Gurjit Singh	253	19.09.2024	22/29/61 of NDPS Act, 1985	Civil Lines Batala	Batala

2. The allegation against the main accused – Sarup Singh is that he was found in possession of 50 loose intoxicating tablets on 19.09.2024, in the area near Hansali Drain, Batala. During interrogation, Sarup Singh suffered a disclosure statement, wherein he revealed that it was the petitioner – Gurjit Singh, who had supplied the aforesaid tablets. On the basis of said statement, the petitioner was arrested on 19.10.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that despite his arrest, no recovery of any drug or narcotic substance was effected from his



possession. He argues that except the disclosure statement, no other incriminating evidence has been collected during investigation, and as per settled law, such disclosure statement is inadmissible in evidence. Learned counsel further informs that after completion of investigation, final report has already been presented before the trial Court; however, out of 18 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined so far. It is also pointed out that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Hence, he prays for grant of concession of regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while opposing the plea for bail, submits that the recovery of intoxicating tablets and drug trafficking is a serious menace, which has severely impacted society, particularly the youth, and therefore, granting bail in such matters may send a wrong signal and undermine the efforts to curb the drug problem. However, on instructions, learned State counsel admits that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case, more particularly, under the NDPS Act.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

6. It is not in dispute that except for the disclosure statement of co-accused Sarup Singh, no recovery of any contraband has been effected from the petitioner. The only allegation against him is that of having supplied the tablets to the main accused. He is a first-time offender and is not involved in any other criminal case. The trial is still at its initial stage, as out of 18 prosecution witnesses only one has been examined, and the conclusion of proceedings is likely to take considerable time. In such circumstances, keeping the petitioner incarcerated for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose.



Therefore, considering the totality of the circumstances, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here-above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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.

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

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 16, 2025

J.Ram

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