

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

2026:PHHC:058034



**CRM-M-19465-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.04.2026**

BALTEJ SINGH

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Nitika Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (439 Cr.P.C.) in FIR No.61 dated 14.07.2021, under Sections 21(c), 27-A & 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and Sections 25/27/30 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 212, 216 & 109 IPC (249, 253, 49 of BNS) registered at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the FIR has been registered on the basis of secret information that co-accused Gursewak Singh has been an active criminal and used to provide shelter to the criminals and was harbouring two young persons at his house. Thereafter raid was conducted and three accused persons namely Gursewak Singh @ Babla, Amritpreet Singh and Jagpreet Singh were arrested from whom 300 grams of heroin and one country made pistol .315 bore was recovered. Subsequently, on the disclosure statement of Amritpreet Singh 1 kg heroin and one .12 bore pistol was also recovered alongwith one .315 bore rifle from Gursewak Singh. The

petitioner has been nominated in the present FIR on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Amritpreet Singh and Jagpreet Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been implicated falsely in the present case. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the alleged recovery of contraband. Moreover, co-accused Amritpreet Singh and Gursewak Singh have already been granted bail by the Co-Ordinate Bench of this Court vide orders dated 15.01.2024 and 15.04.2024 passed in CRM-M-52742-2022 and CRM-M-6572-2024 respectively. The petitioner is in custody since long and no recovery has been effected from him. He prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rohit Hans, D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the recovery of the contraband; co-accused have already been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court; the petitioner is in custody since long and conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, *'bail is rule and jail is*

exception’.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

17.04.2026

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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