



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

234

CRM-M-21740-2026
Date of decision: 24.04.2026

GURBHEJ SINGH @ BHEJA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Ms. Rashi Verma, Advocate for
Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. 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. 43 dated 19.03.2026, registered under Section(s) 22 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Arniwala, District Fazilka.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, recovery of 30 tablets of Etizolam was effected from the conscious possession of co-accused Amrik Singh @ Mika and Karandeep Singh @ Karni, who were arrested on the spot. The name of the petitioner has figured on the disclosure statement

made by co-accused.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 21.03.2026 and has already been in custody for more than 01 month. She further contends that the backward link of the petitioner with the co-accused from whom recovery had been effected has not been established and no recovery, pursuant to any disclosure, has been effected from the petitioner. She further contends that the Judge Special Court, Fazilka has erroneously recorded that the recovery falls within the purview of commercial quantity. She, however, contends that the said quantity is an intermediate quantity. She further contends that the petitioner is currently in judicial custody and his custodial detention is not required further for conclusion of investigation. She further contends that the Police is yet to file a final report and that continuation of petitioner's custody is not likely to sub serve any larger public interest.

4. Learned State Counsel is not in a position to dispute the same.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration the fact that the recovered quantity is an intermediate quantity and 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 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.

APRIL 24, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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