



225 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18665-2026

Date of decision : 16.04.2026

Amritpal Singh @ Bhundi

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Dolli Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuljinder Dhindsa, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.271 dated 28.12.2025, under Sections 21-B, 27-A, 61 and 85 of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Chheharta, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that on 28.12.2025, when the police party in connection with search of bad men going from Miri Piri Academy Road towards Chheharta Sahib Road, a young man was seen coming on foot and on seeing the police, he got scared and started turning back and taking out something heavy wrapped in a wax envelope from the right pocket of his lower pyjama with his right hand and throwing it however, he was apprehended by the police. On asking, he disclosed his name as Amritpal Singh @ Bhundi. He was suspected to be carrying some contraband in a wax envelope and hence, the search was conducted. On conducting the search of the wax envelope, 54 grams of heroin and Rs.4,500/- Indian Currency Notes were recovered. He failed to produce any license regarding possession of the contraband and thus, the FIR was registered, investigation commenced and the petitioner was arrested on the



spot. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing counsel for the parties, the same was declined vide order dated 07.03.2026. Being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She has contended that the alleged recovery of 54 grams of Heroin is non-commercial in nature, thus, provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are not attracted in this case. She has also contended that there is a violation of Section 50 of NDPS Act. She has submitted that though the petitioner was falsely implicated in one more case, however, he is on bail in the same. She thus, has prayed that the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the 54 grams of heroin and Rs.4,500/- as drug money was effected from the petitioner. He, on instructions, has submitted that the case is under investigation and challan is yet to be presented. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner, in the present case, on the allegations of 54 grams of Heroin, was arrested on 28.12.2025. The alleged recovery which is non-commercial in nature was effected from the public place. As contended, there is violation of Section 50 of the NDPS Act. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has undergone incarceration of 03 months and 15 days as on 15.04.2026. It further reflects that though the petitioner is involved in 01 more case, however, he is on bail in the same. As submitted,



challan is yet to be presented.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

16.04.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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