



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

230

CRM-M No.51314 of 2025
Date of decision: 21.11.2025

Mahabir Singh @ Goldy ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sunny Saggar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0015	20.01.2024	Gate Hakima, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar	21(c), 23, 27A and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short ‘NDPS Act’), 212, 216, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC and 25 of Arms Act, 1959

2025:PHHC:163369



2. As per the allegations, on 20.01.2024, accused Harmandeep Singh @ Harman was apprehended along with his car bearing registration No.PB46-AH-5494 and 2 kgs. of heroin, one electronic scale and drug money of Rs.1.25 lakhs were recovered from his conscious possession. He was formally arrested. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and took the names of the co-accused Manpreet Singh @ Manna who too was arrested on 22.01.2024. On his disclosure, the additional accused Lovejeet Singh and Manjit Singh were nominated who were arrested on 24.01.2024. Based on disclosure statement of the co-accused Lovejeet Singh and Manjit Singh, 01 kg. of heroin and drug money of Rs.4 lakhs were recovered on 25.01.2024 from their residential house. The accused Kans Kaur was also nominated as an additional accused and was arrested on 28.01.2024. On further disclosure statement of Lovejeet Singh and Manjit Singh, the present petitioner and his father were nominated as accused and were arrested on 04.03.2025. The petitioner suffered a disclosure statement admitting that he along with his father was involved in drug peddling. His father recovered one pistol, one spring field gun, several live cartridges and drug money of Rs.1 lakh. The mobile phones of the petitioner and co-accused were also taken into custody and on checking, they were found to be containing several

2025:PHHC:163369



virtual/foreign/Whatsapp numbers. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. No recovery has been effected from him. Recovery from his car has been falsely planted. The rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act are not attracted qua him. The co-accused has been extended benefit of bail. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. He has clean antecedents. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Per contra, it is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The well settled proposition of law is that the Court while considering an application for grant of bail has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a prima facie case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment in the

2025:PHHC:163369



event of conviction; the danger of accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail and reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened. The period of incarceration is also relevant fact that is to be considered. It is also unequivocally established that, to be granted bail, the accused charged with offence under the provisions of NDPS Act must fulfill the conditions stipulated in Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

7. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the co-accused Lovejeet Singh and Manjit Singh, from whom recovery of commercial quantity of contraband has been effected. In *Tofan Singh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1*, it was observed by Hon'ble Apex Court that the disclosure statements made under Section 67 of NDPS Act, are inadmissible in evidence unless corroborated by independent material. While the veracity of the disclosure statement against the petitioner will be tested during the course of trial, however, at this stage, it cannot be ignored that no recovery was ever effected from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 04.03.2025. Challan has been presented. The trial will take time. The object of jail is to secure the appearance of the accused during the trial and it can neither be punitive nor preventive and the deprivation of liberty has been considered as a punishment. As per the discussion made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the

2025:PHHC:163369



petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned and on the following conditions:-

- (i) the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner whatsoever.
- (ii) he shall not leave the country under any circumstance without permission of the learned trial Court.
- (iii) he shall appear before the learned trial Court as and when directed.
- (iv) he shall provide his address where he would be residing after release and shall not change the same without informing the concerned IO/SHO.
- (v) the petitioner shall upon his release give his mobile phone number to concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switch on all times.

8. In the event of there being any FIR/complaint lodged against the petitioner, it shall be open to the respondent to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove



shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

21.11.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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