

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

2026:PHHC:039019



235

CRM-M-12219-2026

Date of decision: 12.03.2026

Date of uploading: 13.03.2026

Lovepreet Singh

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Davinder Singh Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 147 dated 18.09.2025 under Sections 21, 29, 27-A of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Doraha, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana.
2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 18.09.2025, the police party was on routine patrolling duty for checking of suspicious persons in front of MB Chicken Market, G.T. Road, Doraha. Where they apprehended accused Gurlal Singh @ Gora with 300 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered from his possession. During investigation, on the basis of the

disclosure statement of Gurlal Singh @ Gora, accused Mohd. Irsad, Davinder Singh and Lovepreet Singh were nominated on 19.09.2025. Accused Davinder Singh was arrested on 20.09.2025 and 705 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered from him. Thereafter, accused Mohd. Irsad was arrested on 21.09.2025 accused Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi was arrested on 24.09.2025 and he disclosed the name of Roop Singh, Jagga Singh, Tejveer Singh and 271 grams of heroin was recovered from them. Accused-Lovepreet Singh also disclosed that he used to contact co-accused Gurlal Singh through his mobile and also stated that Kashmir Giri and Dinkar Kalia @ Shenty Kalia used to buy heroin from him. On his disclosure statement, Dinkar Kalia @ Shenty Kalia was nominated in the present case. On 26.09.2025, Dinkar Kalia @ Shenty Kalia, Vicky and Gulshan @ Gucchi and Vicky were arrested from a car bearing registration No. PB-26K-4051 and 30 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered from their possession.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case as he was not named in the FIR. He further submits that he has been nominated only on the basis of disclosure statement made by the co-accused, which is inadmissible in evidence. It is argued that the alleged recovery falls within the ambit of non-commercial quantity. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 25.09.2025.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious. He has filed the custody

certificate of the petitioner in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has been in custody for the last 05 months and 11 days and is stated to be involved in multiple other more cases.

5. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the trial is yet to commence and it will take a considerable time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served for further incarceration of the petitioner. As the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months and 11 days; continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Hence, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Accordingly, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

7. 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 bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. Nothing said hereinabove shall be considered as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

		(SUMEET GOEL)
		JUDGE
March 12, 2026		
Naveen	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable:	Yes/No