



239

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

CRM-M No.16643 of 2026

Date of Decision: 04.05.2026

Akashdeep Singh @ Tara**..... Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab**..... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Birinder Pal Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.49, dated 17.07.2024, under Section 105 BNS (Sections 20, 29-61-85 of NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station City Raikot, District Ludhiana.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Manjeet Kaur. It was alleged that her elder son, namely, Tarlochan Singh was unmarried. He was a drug addict and was taking medicines from Civil Hospital, Jagraon. It was alleged that on 17.07.2024, at about 7:30 A.M., Akashdeep Singh @ Tara, i.e. the petitioner, took her son, namely, Tarlochan Singh, on motorcycle with him. He was given some poisonous substance from Raikot and thereafter, he had thrown his son in front of the



house of the complainant. On seeing her son, they raised noise, however, Akashdeep Singh @ Tara ran away from there. Thereafter, they found that her son had died. It was alleged that son of the complainant died because of taking syringe of narcotics. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the culprit. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 17.07.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of the charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge, Ludhiana declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 03.09.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-531-2025, however the same was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 19.03.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing of present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner has been alleged to have taken the deceased, namely, Tarlochan Singh, along with him and thereafter, he allegedly left him at his home. He has submitted that the deceased, namely, Tarlochan Singh, has died at his home. He has submitted that on the allegation of administering the Morphine to the deceased, the petitioner has been roped in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal



antecedents as he has never been prosecuted in any other criminal case. He has submitted that charges in the present case have been framed in May, 2025 and since then, not even a single witness has been examined, however, the fundamental right of speedy trial has been miserably defeated. He has submitted that all the co-accused are already on bail. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 17.07.2024 He has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that it is the petitioner, who has taken the deceased, namely, Tarlochan Singh, along with him and after administering the Morphine, he allegedly left him at his house, where he subsequently died. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is facing prosecution for administering the Morphine to the deceased, namely, Tarlochan Singh. It has been contended before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is no direct evidence against the petitioner to substantiate the allegations as levelled against him. As contended before this Court, charges have been framed in may, 2025. Out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 09 months and 13 days



as on 02.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

04.05.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No