



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

225

**CRM-M-22957-2026 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 30.04.2026.**

Vicky Singh

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Mamta Saini, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Vicky Singh, aged 31 years, has filed this petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.26 dated 08.03.2025, registered under Section 22-C of NDPS Act at Police Station Sirhind, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. As per case of the prosecution, while police team was on patrolling duty and had installed a Naka, two motorcycles were noticed coming without number plates and total four persons (2+2) were riding over those motorcycles. On being intercepted, driver of one motorcycle disclosed his name as Simranjeet Singh @ Janta and his co-accused Vicky Singh (petitioner herein) was his pillion rider over it.

Another motorcycle was being driven by Gurwinder Singh and his co-accused Vikas Batta was pillion rider over it. On effecting search, 1200 Lomotil intoxicant tablets (each) were recovered from the dicky of both

motorcycles (total 2400 tablets). Counsel argues that 1200 tablets contained the salt weighing 75.600 grams and same is thus 'commercial quantity'.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner was a pillion rider having no connection with the motorcycle and, thus, there was no knowledge to him of the tablets lying in the dicky of the motorcycle. Moreover, the motorcycle was in full control of its driver i.e. co-accused Simranjeet Singh @ Janta and, thus, there was no reason with the petitioner to have knowledge of conscious possession of the tablets lying in the dicky of the motorcycle. Petitioner is aged 31 years and never in his past career, his involvement was found there under NDPS Act. Out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined till date, whereas the petitioner is inside jail for the last 01 year, 01 month and 19 days. It is yet to be ascertained whether petitioner was having any prior knowledge of the contraband or not. Trial of the case is likely to consume considerable time. Thus, prays for grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 29.04.2026. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper book.

Learned State counsel opposed the bail on the ground that keeping in view the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto.

6. Petitioner is aged 31 years and is not involved in any other case under NDPS Act. Out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined till date and petitioner is inside jail for the last 01 year, 01 month

and 19 days. It is yet to be ascertained whether petitioner was having any prior knowledge of the contraband or not. Trial of the case is likely to consume considerable time. Since it is admitted position even by learned State counsel that petitioner was never found indulged in any other case under NDPS Act, present case being first case against him under NDPS Act, he requires to be afforded an opportunity to rehabilitate him in the society.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular 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.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.** Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

30.04.2026

jitender

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