



CRM-M-22784-2026

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

218

CRM-M-22784-2026

Date of decision : 29.04.2026

ANMOL SINGH @ ANMOL @ PANNU

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. G.S. Kaura, Advocate,
Ms. Shubh Karmak Kaur Kaura, Advocate,
Mr. Amanpreet Singh Dhiman, Advocate,
Mr. Dhruv Trehan, Advocate, Mr. Rangat Joshi, Advocate and
Mr. Malkeet Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023(erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.), in case FIR No.184 dated 30.11.2024, under Sections 21-C/29-61-85 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station STF SAS Nagar, District Amritsar (Annexure P-1).
2. The case of the prosecution is that on the basis of a secret information, co-accused Jatinder Pal Singh was apprehended by the police from whom recovery of 566 grams of heroin was allegedly effected. It is alleged that during the course of investigation, co-accused Jatinder Pal Singh suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he along with the petitioner-Anmol @ Pannu is indulged in sale of heroin at large scale.



CRM-M-22784-2026

-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was arraigned as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Besides the disclosure statement, there is no incriminating material which would connect him with the alleged offence. It is submitted that the petitioner, at the time of filing of the aforesaid FIR, was confined in jail in another FIR and could not have possibly arranged the contraband for the co-accused. He further submits that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and there is non-compliance of mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 11 months and 21 days. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as challan is yet to be presented.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He, upon instructions, submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 11 months and 21 days. He, upon instructions, submits that challan is yet to be presented.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 11 months and 21 days, no recovery has been effected from him and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as challan is yet to be presented, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of



CRM-M-22784-2026

-3-

regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

7. 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 bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

April 29, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No