



CRM-M-3829 of 2026

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-3829 of 2026

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

Manveer @ Manvir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Mohd. Yousaf, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.95 dated 08.07.2025 registered under Section 105 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 21, 22 and 27 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Sadar Ahmedgarh, District Malerkotla.
2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that son of the complainant (Dilpreet Singh) died due to overdose of intoxicant allegedly provided by the petitioner along with other co-accused. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. He argued that the alleged occurrence took place on 07.07.2025 but the FIR in question was registered on 08.07.2025 i.e. after a delay of 01 day, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He further argued that as per the complainant, three persons were named in the FIR who were

**CRM-M-3829 of 2026****-2-**

accompanying the deceased and brought his son to his house but during investigation, the police found that co-accused Amanpreet Singh was not found along with the deceased and was declared innocent, which again creates doubt on the prosecution version. He further argued that even if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, the only allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was accompanying the deceased and co-accused but there is no incriminating material on record to connect him with the alleged offence. He further argued that the petitioner has been roped in the present case only on the basis of suspicion without any concrete evidence. He argued that even otherwise, the allegations as entailed in the FIR do not satisfy the ingredients of Section 105 of BNS. No recovery is to be effected from him. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 09.07.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that there are total 16 prosecution witnesses and out of which, only 08 have been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and status report in the matter, which are taken on record and while referring to the status report, he has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.



CRM-M-3829 of 2026

-3-

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 09 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges framed; out of 16 witnesses, only 08 have been examined till date; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial; which is proceeding at snail's pace, and will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

29.04.2026

D.Bansal

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