



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

**210+110**

**CRM-M-54195-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 13.11.2025**

Harpreet Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner(s).  
Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

**CRM-43781-2025**

Application is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions. Photocopy of FIR No.39 dated 20.05.2025 registered under Sections 21(b), 27A and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Majitha Road, Amritsar, as Annexure P-3 is taken on record.

Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place with page marking.

**Main case:**

1. The instant petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.39 dated 20.05.2025, registered under Section(s) 21(b), 27A and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic



210+110

CRM-M-54195-2025 (O&amp;M)

Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Majitha Road, District Amritsar, Punjab.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the police party, while on patrol, apprehended two young boys on suspicion. Both were carrying bags, and during the interception, one of them, identified as Harpreet Singh (the petitioner herein), allegedly threw away the bag in his possession. Upon checking, one kilogram of opium was recovered from the said bag, while a sum of ₹4,37,000/- was recovered from the bag carried by the co-accused, Sajanpreet Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been wrongly implicated in the instant case. He contends that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 20.05.2025 and is not involved in any other criminal case. He contends that the recovered contraband falls under intermediate quantity and that the final report in the instant FIR is yet to be filed. He further contends that the petitioner is in judicial custody and his further custodial detention is not warranted. Moreover, the trial would take a long time in its conclusion.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner which is nearly 06 months as well as the fact that the recovered quantity is non-commercial. He also does not dispute that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

5. Taking into consideration the recovery effected, the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial, his clean



210+110

CRM-M-54195-2025 (O&amp;M)

antecedents, and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear 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 hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

13.11.2025

Mangal Singh

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