



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

215

CRM-M-9325-2026.

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026.

Shamsher Singh @ Billa

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Monish Kamra, Advocate and
Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mr. Vinay Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Shamsher Singh @ Bila, aged 30 years, has filed this petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.191 dated 01.12.2025 under Sections 21, 27-A, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Chattiwind, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per case of the prosecution, on 01.12.2025, from the possession of the main accused namely Major Singh @ Babbo, 05 grams of Heroin was recovered along with drug money of Rs.300/-. After registration of FIR, through the disclosure statement of the said accused, petitioner was involved as 'supplier' of the recovered contraband and thus, made accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that except of the disclosure statement of co-accused, there is no substantive evidence against the petitioner to confirm the allegations which have been incorporated in the co-accused's disclosure statement. Petitioner is already facing three other cases under NDPS Act, however, in the present case, after arrest of the petitioner, no narcotic contraband since was recovered, bar under Section 37 of NDPS Act, won't be applicable in the strict senses against him. Moreover, allegations are based upon a very weak kind of evidence i.e. disclosure statement of the co-accused. Thus, chances of conviction are very weak and learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Mehal Singh, submits that petitioner is already facing three other cases under NDPS Act and thus, he is not entitled to any relief.

5. In response to the said contention, petitioner's counsel argues that petitioner being already known to the police has been falsely involved as accused in the present case though there is no substance of truth. Moreover, no any narcotic contraband could be recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

6. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel.

7. Considering the above said circumstances in totality, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.**

Pending application, if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

29.04.2026

jitender

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