



CRM-M-3198-2026

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

219

CRM-M-3198-2026
Date of decision : 13.05.2026

ARTHDEEP SINGH ALIAS DEEP

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.132 dated 08.07.2025 under Section 21(c) of the NDPS Act 1985, (Sections 27 & 29 of the NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Kotwali, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. The case of the prosecution is that co-accused Lakhveer Singh and Prabhjeet Singh, who were travelling in a Fortuner car, were apprehended and upon search, two bags containing 20 kg of heroin each (totalling 40 kg of heroin) allegedly recovered from the vehicle, which falls within the ambit of commercial quantity. During the course of investigation, the said co-accused have suffered disclosure statements alleging that the recovered contraband was to be delivered to the present petitioner.

**CRM-M-3198-2026****-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was arraigned as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement(s) of co-accused(s). Besides the disclosure statement(s), there is no incriminating material regarding any call details, money trail etc. qua the petitioner which would connect him with the alleged offence and no recovery has been effected from him. It is further submitted that the disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused(s) during police custody are not admissible in evidence unless duly corroborated by independent material. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 17 days and is not involved in any other case. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He, upon instructions, submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 17 days. He, upon instructions, submits that none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 17 days, he is not involved in any other criminal case, no

**CRM-M-3198-2026****-3-**

recovery has been effected from him and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

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 bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

May 13, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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