



213

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-17924-2026
Decided on : 09.04.2026

Rohit Sidhu @ Mithu . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rohit Sidhu @ Mithu	288	01.11.2025	21 & 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 [S. 27 of NDPS Act, added later on]	Anti Narcotics Force (ANTF), District ANTF Wing	SAS Nagar Mohali

2. As per the prosecution version, instant FIR was registered against Rohit Sidhu alias Mithu (petitioner herein) and Vishal Singh @ Rattan on the basis of secret information and in pursuance thereof, recovery of 51 grams Amphetamine (Ice Drug), 180 grams heroin, drug money of Rs.4,11,790/-, two mobiles, electronic scale and 40 empty transparent pouches was effected from their conscious possession without any licence or permit, on 01.11.2025 in the area L.D. Estate, Geetika Valley, Sangowal. Co-accused Amarjit Singh @ Nikku was nominated as accused in the present case on 04.11.2025 on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Vishal Singh @ Rattan.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that another co-accused, namely Vishal Singh @ Rattan, has already been granted concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 23.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-414-2026, titled as “*Vishal Singh @ Rattan v. State of Punjab*” (P-3), and thus, on the ground of parity with similarly situated co-accused, petitioner seeks grant of regular bail.

4. In the bail order dated 23.02.2026, it has been specifically noticed and recorded that said co-accused (Vishal Singh @ Rattan) was not previously involved in any criminal case. Further, the residential flat, from where the recovery of narcotic substance was effected from a bag lying on the sofa set, had been taken on rent by the present petitioner – Rohit Sidhu @ Mithu from its owner, namely Inderjeet Singh. Thus, role attributed to the bailed out co-accused (Vishal Singh @ Rattan) cannot be said to be similar to that of present petitioner.

5. The contraband recovered in the present case is of commercial quantity and, therefore, the case is hit by the rigours of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Keeping in view the recovery of heavy quantity of contraband, the gravity of the offence and seriousness of the allegations, this Court does not find it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, prayer for bail is **dismissed**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 09, 2026

J.Ram

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