



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

236-2

CRM-M-51670-2025
Decided on : 27.11.2025

Jobanpreet Singh @ Jagdeep

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. G.N. Ganeriwala, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Bareen Pratap Singh, AAG, 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
Jobanpreet Singh @ Jagdeep	225	19.12.2024	21 of NDPS Act, 1985 [S. 29 of NDPS Act, 1985]	Division No.8	Jalandhar

2. As per allegations in the FIR, initially 100 grams of heroin was recovered from the main accused – Karan @ Kanna. During investigation, two more accused, namely; Rahul and Prem Singh, were nominated on the basis of his disclosure statement. Upon their arrest, 700 grams of heroin was recovered from accused Rahul and 150 grams of heroin was recovered from accused Prem Singh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that only upon the



further disclosure statement made by co-accused Prem Singh, petitioner has been nominated as the alleged supplier of 150 grams of heroin. It is urged that the petitioner is inside jail since 27.12.2024 and admittedly, no recovery of any contraband or narcotic substance has been effected from his possession. Except being named in the disclosure statement of a co-accused, there is no other substantive evidence collected by the prosecution during investigation to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the petitioner is 30 years of age and is not involved in any other similar case under the NDPS Act. Therefore, he deserves an opportunity to reform and reintegrate himself in the society. Thus, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report and custody certificate dated 25.11.2025 in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. Copies thereof have been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail and explaining the role attributed to other co-accused persons, submits that total recovery effected from all the co-accused in the present case, clearly indicates the petitioner's active involvement in the narcotics trafficking chain.

Besides, learned State counsel submits that the offence is serious in nature and attracts stringent punishment, warranting custodial trial. Petitioner's release on bail at this stage, may hamper the ongoing investigation and trial. Moreover, large quantity of narcotics involved indicates the gravity of the case, and granting bail would send a wrong



signal to those indulging in drug trafficking.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual submissions made by the petitioner's counsel. It is also an admitted position that the process of recording prosecution evidence is yet to commence and no recovery has been effected from the petitioner, whose implication rests solely on the disclosure statement of a co-accused.

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

6. Admittedly, petitioner is behind bars since 27.12.2024, i.e., for more than 11 months and trial has not commenced as even the recording of statements of prosecution witnesses is yet to begin, which is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Further, it is noticed that petitioner's implication in the present case is solely based on the disclosure statement of a co-accused, which is a very weak piece of evidence at this stage. Also, petitioner is a young person aged about 30 years and is not found involved in any other case of similar nature. Having regard to the above circumstances, continued incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. Therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner, so as to enable him to rehabilitate himself in society and join the normal course of life.

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. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

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**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 27, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No