

2026.PHHC.046417



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

220

CRM-M-15044-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.03.2026

Bikramjit Singh @ Vicky Varlad

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

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

Ms. Manjot Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.75 dated 27.04.2025, registered under Sections 18 of NDPS Act, Section 52-A of Prisons Act (Sections 21, 27-A, 29 of NDPS Act, Section 25 of Arms Act, Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 111(2) BNS added later on), at Police Station City-1, Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 3 months and 9 days. He alleges false implication. His name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Gurinder and Lovejeet who were implicated based on the statement of co-accused Parshant Majumdar who has been granted bail vide order dated 03.12.2025, Annexure P3. He was in custody when he came to be involved in the present case. As per the allegations, he along with other co-accused had delivered the mobile phone to jail inmates, one

of whom Sultan Singh has been granted bail vide order dated 25.02.2026, Annexure P12 and recovery of SIM Card was effected. Besides the above co-accused ASI Ashok Kumar, Gurchet Singh, Banso Bai and Gurpreet Singh, who is DSP have been granted bail. Charges have been framed on 12.12.2025 and only 1, out of 46 PWs, has been examined. He is involved in 9 more cases and in custody only in one of which. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 23.03.2026 filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 3 months and 9 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations levelled against the petitioner by his co-accused of having supplied mobile phone to the jail inmates. However, she is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage and co-accused having been enlarged on bail.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are

several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail.”

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 3 months and 9 days; co-accused are on bail; charges were framed on 12.12.2025 and out of 46 PWs, only 1, has yet been examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

8. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.

- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

24.03.2026
ashok

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