



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

227

CRM-M-22239-2026
Decided on : 20.05.2026

Rampal Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Pardeep Sihmar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The 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 FIR Petitioner(s) No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rampal Singh 0031	09.04.2025	S. 15, 29, 61 of NDPS Act, 1985	Khanauri	Sangrur

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that on the basis of secret information, recovery of 75 kilograms of poppy husk was effected from the main accused, Raj Kumar. Subsequently, as per the disclosure statement made by Raj Kumar, it allegedly came to light that the said contraband had been supplied to him by one Toni Singh and Rampal Singh (petitioner herein).

3. It is further submitted that apart from the said disclosure



statement, which was recorded after registration of the FIR and subsequent to the arrest of main accused, there exists no other material or corroborative evidence to substantiate the allegation against the petitioner. Therefore, disclosure statement, being devoid of any legal sanctity or independent corroboration, cannot form the sole basis for implicating the petitioner in the present case.

4. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner, who is aged 41 years, and is inside jail for the last more than a period of 01 month and 24 days, is a Government employee posted in the Public Health Department, as 'Pump Operator', and has nothing to do with the present crime or the narcotic substance. Besides, petitioner never in his past carrier ever found involved in any criminal offence, more particularly, under the NDPS Act. In the present case also, there is no other evidence collected during investigation, except of disclosure statement of main accused – Raj Kumar. Therefore, in the given facts & circumstances, learned counsel seeks concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel while vehemently opposes the prayer for bail submits that keeping in view the nature of allegations and gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve concession of regular bail.

Further, learned State counsel has also produced an extract of the telephonic conversation between the main accused, Raj Kumar (mobile No. 97795-10922), and co-accused Toni Singh (mobile No. 95921-15527) as well as Rampal Singh (mobile No. 93156-75681), covering the period during which the recovery was effected.



However, learned State counsel fairly admits the other factual assertions made and noticed here-above, more particularly the fact that except of the present case, petitioner is not involved in any other case under any provision of criminal law or NDPS Act.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

7. It is not disputed that the petitioner is a Government employee working in the Department of Public Health, Haryana, and that he has been implicated in the present case primarily on the basis of disclosure statement made by the main accused. Thus, apart from the disclosure statement, authenticity of the call details vis-à-vis involvement of the petitioner in the present crime, would be a matter to be determined during the course of trial, which is likely to consume considerable time.

Besides, the petitioner is aged about 41 years and is not shown to be involved in any other case under the NDPS Act in his past career. Even in the present case, nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

8. Therefore, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case; nature of allegations; period of custody already undergone by the petitioner; and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial



Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.
10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.
11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.
12. Petition stands **disposed of**.
- Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 20, 2026
J.Ram

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