



215

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

CRM-M-3320-2026

Date of Decision: 02.07.2026

Kulveer Singh @ Keera

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Charnjit Singh Bahia, Advocate and
Mr. Sumeet Singh Brar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. (corresponding Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.0141 dated 12.09.2024 registered under Sections 21(c)/27/29 of NDPS Act, 1985, at Police Station STF, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. As per case of the prosecution, the alleged recovery of 265 grams of heroin, which is marginally above the commercial quantity, has been recovered from the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the alleged contraband involved in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner was not even present at the time and place of alleged recovery, rather he was falsely implicated in the present case just to make him a scapegoat. He further submits that out of total 22 prosecution witnesss, no witness has been

examined so far. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 12.09.2024 and is in custody since then. Trial is likely to take long time. No useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. Thus, it is prayed that he may be released on regular bail. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgments in (i) **CRM-M-37684-2021, Balwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 14.02.2022; (ii) **CRM-M-8212-2022, Tajinder Singh vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 03.03.2022 and (iii) **CRM-M-35186-2016, Manjit Kaur @ Jeeto vs. State of Punjab**, decided on 01.12.2016.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, custody period of the petitioner and also the fact that the quantity of alleged contraband is marginally above the 'commercial quantity', but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

6. Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

02.07.2026.
hemlata

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