



CRM-M-3512-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

236

**CRM-M-3512-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 20.04.2026**

SURAJ SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Ankush Rampal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.195 dated 02.09.2025 under Sections 21(b), 27 & 29 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 02.09.2025, co-accused namely, Kuldeep Singh was apprehended on the basis of suspicion, from whom a polythene containing 08 grams of heroin was recovered. Later on, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Kuldeep Singh, Suraj Singh (the present petitioner) was nominated as a supplier of the alleged contraband.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; he has been



nominated on the basis of disclosure statement which is inadmissible in the eyes of law; the contraband allegedly, recovered from the co-accused, is marginally higher than the small quantity; the co-accused namely Kuldeep Singh from whose possession, the alleged contraband was recovered, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Court of learned Special Court, Bathinda, vide order dated 09.10.2025 (Annexure P-2); the petitioner is involved in 06 more cases out of which 03 cases are registered under the NDPS Act, 1985 and he is on bail in these cases; investigation in the present case has been completed and challan stands presented, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars; trial will take sufficient time to conclude; the petitioner is stated to have been in custody since 24.11.2025 and as such, prays for concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State, and by way of filing of custody certificate dated 20.04.2026, opposed the concession of regular bail to the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in 06 more cases and 03 of them are registered under the NDPS Act, 1985, however he is on bail in these cases; as per disclosure statement of the co-accused, the present petitioner is supplier of the contraband in question. He, however, fairly admits that investigation in the present case is complete & challan in the present case, stands presented before the trial Court; the quantity of the



contraband involved in the present case, falls under the category of intermediate quantity; the petitioner has been in custody for a period of 04 months & 26 days.

6. Heard.

7. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and the fact that the present petitioner has been nominated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement by the co-accused namely, Kuldeep Singh from whom 08 grams of heroin has been recovered; alleged contraband i.e. 08 grams of *heroin* recovered from the co-accused falls in the category of intermediate quantity; the co-accused namely Kuldeep Singh from whose possession, the alleged contraband was recovered, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the trial Court vide order dated 09.10.2025 (Annexure P-2); investigation is complete & challan stands presented; the present petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months & 26 days; 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 as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, 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.



8. 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.

9. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an opinion on the merits of the main case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

20.04.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO