



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

219

CRM-M-14544-2026

Date of decision : 04.05.2026

Date of uploading:04.05.2026

Gurpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.295 dated 04.12.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 21, 27 & 27-A of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') at Police Station Division No.8, Jalandhar.

2. The gravamen of allegations against the petitioner is that the petitioner is an accused of being involved in an FIR pertaining to NDPS Act involving alleged recovery of 80 grams of heroin along with drug money of Rs. 2,05,000/- from the co-accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 04.12.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question.



Learned counsel has further submitted that mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act have not scrupulously been complied with, and thus, the prosecution case suffers from inherent defects. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the contraband allegedly recovered from the petitioner is 80 grams of heroin, which falls within the category of non-commercial quantity. It is further submitted that the State has sought to invoke the rigour of Section 37 on the basis of the alleged recovery of ₹2,05,000/- as drug money, the foundation whereof is the disclosure/confessional statement of the petitioner, which is not tenable in law. Learned counsel has further urged that the petitioner has clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit dated 25.04.2026 in Court today. The same be kept on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 02.05.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 04.12.2025 and is in continuous custody since then. The culmination of investigation and the trial emanating therefrom, in case, occasion so arises, will take long time. It is further not disputed before this Court that the contraband allegedly recovered from the petitioner is 80 grams of heroin, which falls within the



category of non-commercial quantity. The tenability and evidentiary value of the alleged confessional/disclosure statement of the petitioner, as well as the allegation that the recovery of ₹2,05,000/- from the petitioner constitutes drug money, are matters which are required to be adjudicated upon during the course of trial. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer to a judgment passed by this Court in ***Anshul Sardana versus State of Punjab***, passed in ***CRM-M-65094-2024*** (2025: PHHC:004198), wherein, after relying upon the *ratio decidendi* of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Tofan Singh versus State of Tamil Nadu, AIR 2020 Supreme Court 5592; Smt. Najmunisha, Abdul Hamid Chandmiya @ Ladoo Bapu versus State of Gujrat, Narcotics Control Bureau, 2024 INSC 290; State by (NCB) Bengaluru vs. Pallulabid Ahmad Arimutta & Anr.', 2022 (1) RCR (Criminal) 762; and Vijay Singh vs. The State of Haryana, bearing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.(s) 1266/2023, decided on 17.05.2023, has held thus:

“6.3 It is a well established principle of law that a confession made by a co-accused under Section 67 of the NDPS Act is inherently a very weak piece of evidence. Such statement(s), by themselves, cannot form the sole basis for the conviction of an individual and must be scrutinized with utmost caution in conjunction with other substantive evidence. Moreover, no recovery has been effected from the possession of the petitioner, who has been subsequently implicated as an accused solely on the basis of disclosure



statement of the co-accused. However, as regular bail pertains to life and liberty of individual, Courts are obligated to strike a balance between safeguarding personal liberty and ensuring the effective administration of justice as also investigation. The final evidentiary value and admissibility of the disclosure statement made by a co-accused fall within the domain of the trial Court and are to be adjudicated during the course of the trial in accordance with established principles of law. However, while adjudicating a plea for regular bail, this Court cannot remain oblivious to the circumstances under which the petitioner has been arraigned or implicated, including the nature of the allegations, the evidence linking the petitioner to the offence as well as the specific role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence. A prima facie examination of these factors is essential to ensure that the process of law is not misused, abused or misdirected.”

6.2. As per custody certificate dated 02.05.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 4 months and 25 days & is shown to be involved in another case. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in another case. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon’ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in ***CRM-M No.38822-2022*** titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.



7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
- (viii) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned trial Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise, the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of



opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

04.05.2026
jaatin

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