



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-21111-2026
Date of decision: 24.04.2026

AJAYPAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Akun Sheemar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant **first petition** has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 30 dated 05.02.2026, registered under Section(s) 21, 27-A of the NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of the NDPS Act added later on) at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present FIR has been registered consequent to an alleged recovery of 10 grams of Heroin from the petitioner alongwith a sum of Rs. 800/- which is cited as drug money. On the basis of the petitioner's disclosure, one co-

accused Vishal Singh was nominated as an accused and Section 27-A of the NDPS Act was also added on the allegation that the petitioner was involved in sale and purchase of heroin. Counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody since 05.02.2026 and has already undergone an actual custody of more than 2 ½ months. The recovered quantity is an intermediate quantity.

3. Learned State Counsel on the other hand contends that the petitioner is involved in two other cases under the NDPS Act, hence, he not be granted the concession of bail. The rest of the contentions are however not being disputed.

4. Learned Counsel contends that in so far as FIR No. 144 of 2025 is concerned, the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of a disclosure statement while in FIR No. 109 of 2022, 15 grams of Heroin was recovered from the possession of the petitioner wherein he is already on bail.

5. Learned State Counsel submits that the final report has not been filed since awaiting the FSL report is still awaited.

6. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the quantity of contraband recovered as well as the period of custody undergone by him and in light of the fact that conclusion of trial shall take long time, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The petitioner shall not leave the country without obtaining permission from the trial Court.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

11. It is further made clear in the event of the petitioner being involved in any other case under the NDPS Act, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for seeking cancellation of the bail in the present case as well.

APRIL 24, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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