



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

256

CRM-M-22307-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 19.05.2026

Parminder Singh @ Sona

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

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

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.314 dated 17.12.2020, registered under Sections 21 & 22 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') (Sections 25, 27-A and 29 of NDPS Act added later on) and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Majitha, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The present FIR was registered on basis of secret information regarding the involvement of accused Jobanpreet Singh and his companions in trafficking of illegal arms and narcotic substance. The petitioner has been nominated subsequently on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Lovepreet Singh @ Lala, with allegations that he was involved in smuggling of illicit weapons and contraband along with co-accused.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for concession of bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:

(i) Petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused.

(ii) Except the disclosure statement of co-accused, which itself is inadmissible in evidence, there is no other material to show complicity of the petitioner in the alleged offence.

(iii) Petitioner is in custody since 06.09.2025.

(iv) Co-accused Lovedeep Singh @ Lala and Jobanpreet Singh have already been granted regular bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide common order dated 28.06.2021 passed in CRM-M-18490-2021 and CRM-M-18757-2021 (Annexure P-2).

(v) Another co-accused, namely, Simarjit Singh @ Simranjit Singh has also been granted regular bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 13.07.2021 passed in CRM-M-18086-2021 (Annexure P-3).

(vi) Challan stands presented and charges have been framed.

(vii) No recovery has been effected from petitioner.

4. Custody certificate dated 18.05.2026 of the petitioner has been filed by learned State counsel and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has been behind bars since 06.09.2025 i.e. for about 08 Months and 12 days.

5. Learned State Counsel opposed the present petition on the following grounds:

(i) Petitioner has actively participated in the commission of the alleged offence.

(ii) The petitioner is a habitual offender and involved in many cases.



(iii) That the petitioner is in custody in another case since 13.07.2021 i.e. for the last 05 years, but the present FIR was registered in the year 2020 and the petitioner was taken into custody in the present case on 06.09.2025.

(iv) However, learned State counsel fairly admitted that present petitioner stands on parity with the co-accused, namely, Lovedeep Singh @ Lala, Jobanpreet Singh and Simarjit Singh @ Simranjit Singh, who have already been granted regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court as stated above.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds merits in the present petition on the following grounds:

(i) The petitioner has been in custody since 06.09.2025 i.e. for the last 8 months and 12 days.

(ii) Except the disclosure statement of co-accused, which is inadmissible in evidence, there is no other material on record to suggest that he is involved in any other case.

(iii) Similarly placed co-accused Lovedeep Singh @ Lala and Jobanpreet Singh have already been granted regular bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide common order dated 28.06.2021 passed in CRM-M-18490-2021 and CRM-M-18757-2021 (Annexure P-2) and co-accused, namely, Simarjit Singh @ Simranjit Singh has also been granted regular bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 13.07.2021 passed in CRM-M-18086-2021 (Annexure P-3).

(iv) The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period. The concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment, as it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is a rule, jail is an exception.

Hence, in view of aforementioned ground, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

19.05.2026

Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)

JUDGE

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