



CRM-M-6867-2026

1

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

207

CRM-M-6867-2026

Decided on :09.04.2026

Satnam Singh alias Shammu

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Dolli Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS (corresponding Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail in case FIR No.68 dated 29.07.2025 under Sections 22, 27-A and 29 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Tarsikka, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per the prosecution's case, one Jugraj Singh @ Gajji was apprehended by the police, and 5,300 loose intoxicating tablets along with a sum of Rs. 3,500/- as drug money were recovered from his possession.

During interrogation, he made a disclosure statement to the effect that the recovered tablets had been purchased by him from Satnam Singh @ Shamu, Ranjit Singh @ Rana, and Gurwinder Singh @ Goggy. These individuals, in turn, had allegedly purchased the same from Shamsher Singh @ Shera and Daler Singh.

It was further disclosed that Shamsher Singh @ Shera and Daler Singh used to procure the contraband from Ajaypal Singh @ Ajay and Gurjit Singh.

On the basis of these allegations, counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case

**CRM-M-6867-2026****2**

solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of the main accused, namely Jugraj Singh @ Gajji. It is contended that, apart from this disclosure statement, which is, in fact, inadmissible in evidence, no other substantive evidence has been collected during the investigation against the petitioner.

Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 09.12.2025, i.e., for about four months, and therefore prays for the grant of regular bail.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail and submits that the petitioner is the actual person who had been procuring the recovered tablets from his co-accused and had, in turn, supplied a huge quantity of the same to the main accused, Jugraj Singh @ Gajji. Accordingly, it is prayed that the present petition be dismissed.

4. I have considered the submissions addressed by the counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

5. Considering the fact that other similarly situated co-accused, whose names were also disclosed in the disclosure statement, namely, Shamsher Singh @ Shera and Ajay Pal Singh @ Ajay, have been granted anticipatory bail vide orders dated 02.12.2025 (P-5) and 27.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-56858-2025 and CRM-M-66673-2025, respectively, and that co-accused Jugraj Singh @ Gajji and Gurpreet Singh @ Gurjit have been granted interim bail by the learned trial Court vide orders dated 06.10.2025 (P-4) and 19.11.2025 (P-3), respectively, this Court proceeds to consider the present petition.

**CRM-M-6867-2026****3**

It is also noticed that upon the arrest of the petitioner, nothing substantial has been pointed out regarding the effecting of any recovery. The involvement of the petitioner as a supplier is yet to be established by the prosecution.

Moreover, petitioner is in custody since 09.12.2025, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. In these circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further custody.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

7. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.04.2026
Rashmi



CRM-M-6867-2026

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*