



**231+243 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of decision: 06.04.2026

1. CRM-M-2240-2026

BALJEET SINGH ALIAS BALJIT SINGH ALIAS BHATTI

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

2. CRM-M-10078-2026

MANGE RAM

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

**Present: Mr. D.S. Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.
(in CRM-M-2240-2026)**

**Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.
(in CRM-M-10078-2026)**

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of the above-mentioned petitions as both are arising from the same FIR. For the sake of brevity, facts are borrowed from *CRM-M-2240-2026* titled as *Baljeet Singh alias Baljit Singh alias Bhatti vs. State of Punjab*.

2. By way of the present petitions, the petitioners are seeking regular bail in case FIR No.229 dated 12.11.2025 registered under Section



15(b) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Nathusari Chopta, District Sirsa.

3. Brief facts of the present case are that on 12.11.2025, the police arrested petitioner-Baljeet Singh alias Baljit Singh alias Bhatti, who was driving a car. On search of car, three plastic bags containing 46 kgs 800 grams of *Doda Chura Post* was recovered. Hence, the FIR was registered. Petitioner-Mange Ram was nominated as accused on the basis of disclosure statement made by petitioner-Baljeet Singh alias Baljit Singh alias Bhatti.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that in the present matter, the contraband recovered falls under the category of intermediate quantity; petitioners are in custody for the last three months; case of the petitioner-Mange Ram is on same footing with co-accused, namely, Hanuman Ram Jakhal, who has already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***CRM-M No.9277 of 2026*** vide order dated 17.02.2026; investigation has already been completed, therefore, the petitioners are not required for any recovery or investigation purpose; trial will take sufficient time to conclude; all the witnesses are police officials, so there is no apprehension that the petitioners would tamper with the prosecution evidence after getting released on bail. As such, learned counsel prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by the petitioners and submitted that both the petitioners are habitual offenders as petitioner-Baljeet Singh is involved in one more case under Sections 107 and 151 Cr.P.C. and petitioner-Mange Ram is involved in one more case under the



NDPS Act. As such, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petitions.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present cases and the fact that petitioners are in custody for the last 03 months; case of the petitioner-Mange Ram is on same footing with co-accused, namely, Hanuman Ram Jakhal, who has already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***CRM-M No.9277 of 2026*** vide order dated 17.02.2026; investigation has already been completed, therefore, the petitioners are not required for any recovery or investigation purpose; trial will take sufficient time to conclude; there is no material on file which would suggest that after the petitioners will be released on bail, they would tamper with the evidence as all the material witnesses are official witnesses and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping them 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 petitioners.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, both the petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. 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.

10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

April 06, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No