



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

220

CRM-M-9021-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision : 10.03.2026

Ravinder Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Ms. Sujata and Ms. Kavita, Advocates for
Mr. Sidhant Vermani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail is the third petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.168 dated 12.07.2024, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 21 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, hereinafter being referred to as 'NDPS Act', Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'ASI Karmpal Singh', who reported that on 12.07.2024, on the basis of a secret information, a car was intercepted and Ravinder Singh (petitioner herein) and Dharampreet Singh, who were travelling in the said car, were apprehended. As per abovenamed police official, when search of



abovementioned car was conducted, 01 kg of ICE (Crystal Methamphetamine) was recovered.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to recovery of abovementioned contraband, necessary formalities with regard to seizure & sealing of contraband, lodging of FIR, and formal arrest of the accused were performed, and further investigation taken up.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, who has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner, that the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than one year and seven months, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. While claiming that the right to speedy trial and personal liberty of the petitioner is being violated, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the present petition is maintainable and the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

6. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, in the present case the second petition for bail filed by the petitioner has been dismissed on merit, merely 6 ½ months ago, i.e. on 26.08.2025, and that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition, no significant change in circumstances has taken place.



7. The record has been perused carefully.
8. A perusal of record shows that this is third petition for bail filed by the petitioner, and the second petition for bail filed by the petitioner was dismissed on 26.08.2025 on merits. From the date of dismissal of former bail petition, no significant change in circumstances has taken place.
9. As a sequel to abovementioned observations, it is hereby held that the present petition, which is third petition for bail filed by the petitioner, is not maintainable and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby *dismissed*, accordingly.
10. However, it is clarified that any observations made in the abovementioned order shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

10.03.2026
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No