



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

210

CRM-M-55757-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 31.10.2025

Rajbeer @ Chadha @ Ritik ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Devansh Khanna, Advocate and
Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.177, dated 19.06.2025, registered under Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 wherein offence under Sections 21, 27-A and 29 of NDPS were added later on, at Police Station Islamabad, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he was nominated on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, however, nothing has been recovered from his possession as 2 live cartridges were recovered from the personal search of Dhruv @ Bhanu and at his demarcation, 100 grams of heroin and drug money of Rs.10,000/- were also recovered later on; the petitioner has been in custody since the date of arrest i.e. 19.06.2025; he is not involved in any other case except the present one;



CRM-M-55757-2025(O&M)

(2)

investigation qua him has already been completed; trial will take sufficient time to conclude; and hence, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

3. Notice of motion

4. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State. Learned State counsel has opposed the bail petition of the petitioner on the ground that 2 live cartridges, 100 grams of heroin and drug money of Rs.10,000/- were recovered from co-accused and the present petitioner along with co-accused had formed a gang for illegal trafficking of weapons and contraband for its further supply in different parts of the country.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; the present petitioner was nominated on the basis of disclosure statement; no contraband is recovered from his possession; the petitioner has been in custody for a period of more than 4 months; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

CRM-M-55757-2025(O&M)

(3)

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

31.10.2025

Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)

JUDGE

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