



CRM-M-13992-2026 (O&amp;M) -1-

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

261

**CRM-M-13992-2026 (O&M)  
Decided on: 27.04.2026**

**GURPREET SINGH @ BUNTY**

.....Petitioner

**Versus**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Yajur Sharma, 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.280 dated 25.11.2025 under Sections 21(b) of NDPS Act, 1985, (Sections 27-A, 29 of NDPS Act added later on) registered at Police Station B-Division, Police Comissionerate Amritsar.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 25.11.2025, the police party apprehended the present petitioner from whom 201 grams of *heroin* was recovered from his conscious possession. Thereafter, on 27.11.2025, on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by the petitioner, drug money amounting to Rs.12,000/- was recovered from his house. Further on 28.11.2025, the petitioner disclosed that he used to procure the contraband-*heroin* from one Vijaypal Singh @ Tiddu, the recovered



*heroin* was also procured by him from said Vijaypal Singh alias Tiddu through another person.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; the alleged contraband recovered from his possession falls under the category of non-commercial quantity and rigours of Section 37 of NDPS Act would not apply in this case; the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases which are registered under the Arms Act and is on bail in both the cases; investigation in the present case has been completed and challan stands presented; the petitioner has been in custody in the present case for the last more than 05 months, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars; trial will take sufficient time to conclude; the petitioner has been in custody since 25.11.2025 and as such, prays for concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State, and, opposed the concession of regular bail to the petitioner while submitting that 201 grams of *heroin* has been recovered from the possession of the present petitioner; on the basis of disclosure statement of the petitioner himself, drug money amounting to Rs.12,000/- has been recovered from his house; the petitioner is also involved in 02 more cases under the Arms Act. 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 non-commercial quantity; the petitioner has been in custody since 25.11.2025 and as such, prayed for dismissal of grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard.

7. Taking into consideration the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and the totality of the facts & circumstances of the present case that 201 grams of *heroin* has been recovered from the possession of the present petitioner which falls under the category of non-commercial quantity and as such, rigours of Section 37 of NDPS Act would not be attracted in the present case; investigation is complete & challan stands presented; the present petitioner is in custody for the last more than 05 months; 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

27.04.2026  
Sonia Puri

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