



CRM-M-17764-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-17764-2026

Date of Decision: 09.04.2026

Palwinder Singh @ Pundu @ Pindu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Harmanpreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr.K.D.Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.315 dated 27.11.2025 under Sections 21, 27(a), 29 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the police party, while on patrolling on 27.11.2025, saw a young boy coming on foot from the right side of the road. On seeing the police, he got perplexed and tried to throw one blue colour polythene after taking it out from the right pocket of his trouser. However, on suspicion, he was apprehended. On asking, he disclosed his name to be Shamsher Singh @ Shera. He was suspected to be carrying some contraband in the polythene bag, which he was tried to throw and thus, search of the same was conducted. On conducting the search of polythene bag, 50 grams of heroin along with Rs.600/- as drug money was recovered. He failed to produce any licence regarding the conscious possession of the same, thus, the FIR was registered and he was arrested on the spot. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. During the investigation, Shamsher

Singh @ Shera made a disclosure statement about the complicity of the



petitioner, namely, Palwinder Singh @ Pundu @ Pindu. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar, declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 12.03.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Shamsher Singh @ Shera. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 29.01.2026 passed in **CRM-M-3848-2026**, whereby, co-accused Shamsher Singh @ Shera has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is on better footing than co-accused Shamsher Singh @ Shera, as the petitioner has been arrayed as accused in the present case on the disclosure statement of the co-accused. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Shamsher Singh @ Shera. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 30.11.2025 Co-accused, namely, Shamsher Singh @ Shera is on bail and the case of the



CRM-M-17764-2026

-3-

petitioner as stated is at par with him. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 month & 30 days as on 08.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, 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 on the basis of parity. 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.

7. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.04.2026
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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