



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-11524-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 13.05.2026

Lovepreet Singh @ Lovely

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.311 dated 23.11.2025, registered under Section(s) 21, 27-A and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present FIR was registered on the statement of ASI Jaskaran Singh, who stated that co-accused/Lovepreet Singh @ Mann, was apprehended while being in conscious possession of 12 grams of *Heroin* and drug money of Rs.400/-, which he earned by sale of *Heroin*. He stated that during investigation co-accused/Lovepreet Singh @ Mann had suffered a disclosure to the effect that he had purchased the said contraband from Jagjit Singh @ Kaka son of Tarlok Singh and Rajwinder Singh @ Rajbir Singh @ Raju son of Darshan Singh, accordingly the said persons were also nominated as accused. It is submitted that the petitioner has been nominated as an

accused on the disclosure of co-accused/Rajwinder Singh @ Rajbir Singh @ Raju. He contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 23.11.2025 and has been in custody since then. It is submitted that the recovery of contraband in the present case was effected from co-accused/Lovepreet Singh @ Mann, while the petitioner's name is Lovepreet Singh @ Lovely and he has been nominated on the disclosure of co-accused. It is contended that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner in the present case and thus the custodial detention of the petitioner would not advance any interest of justice. He also submits that the recovered contraband falls under the intermediate quantity and rigours of Section 37 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 would not be applicable to the petitioner. He further submits that despite expiry of nearly 06 months, investigation is still pending and hence, the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time.

3. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the proceedings, nature of allegations levelled against him, lack of recovery from him and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate

concerned.

6. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

13.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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