



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

206

CRM-M-12604-2026 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 16.04.2026.

Balkar Sidhu @ Bobby

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sukhcharan Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Balkar Sidhu @ Bobby, aged 25years, has filed this petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.520 dated 16.11.2025 under Sections 21, 29, 61, 85 NDPS Act, registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

2. As per the prosecution, on 16.11.2025, at approximately 10:45 p.m., members of the police team noticed the accused Lovepreet Singh alias Laadi and Sarbo sitting on the ground beside some bushes on the right side, rolling a polythene envelope. Upon seeing the police vehicle, they threw the polythene envelope and stood up. When the polythene bag thrown by the accused was retrieved and weighed, it was found to contain 270 grams of a light brown-colored intoxicant substance. Following the registration of the FIR and subsequent arrest, name of the present petitioner was disclosed as the supplier of the intoxicant substance, and petitioner was thereafter implicated as an accused in the case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that petitioner has been falsely implicated, having no connection with accused Lovepreet Singh @ Laadi and Sarbo or with the recovery of contraband from their possession. Counsel further contends that except from the disclosure statement, in which the petitioner has been nominated, there is no other substantive evidence creating link of the petitioner with the recovered contraband or with the other co-accused.

He further contends that in the present case, petitioner is inside jail since 21.01.2026 and nothing (including any narcotic contraband) has been recovered from his possession after his arrest. Petitioner is nominated as accused in the present case only for the reason that earlier he was facing five other cases under NDPS Act, as detailed in Paragraph 5 of the petition itself, wherein the allegations are regarding very small quantity of Heroin in three of the cases against the petitioner i.e. 6 grams, 5 grams and 11 grams only. The petitioner, being already known to the police officials, was nominated in the present case with the sole motive to nominate him in maximum number of cases. Counsel further submits that co-accused Balkar Sindhu @ Bobby has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Special Court, Malerkotla, vide order dated 27.01.2026 (Annexure P-4). Thus, counsel for petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the bail on the ground that keeping in view the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book along with the documents appended thereto.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, as the petitioner

is inside jail since 21.01.2026 and co-accused Balkar Sindhu @ Bobby has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Special Court, Malerkotla, vide order dated 27.01.2026 (Annexure P-4), 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.

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

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.** Pending application, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.04.2026

jitender

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