



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

224

**CRM-M-22895-2026 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 30.04.2026.**

Ranjit Singh

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Ranjit Singh, aged 30 years, has filed this petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.09 dated 03.02.2024, registered under Sections 22-C and 29 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Sarai Amant Khan, District Tarn Taran .

2. As per allegations in the FIR, on 03.02.2024, co-accused Palwinder Singh @ Vicky along with Jasbir Singh @ Khela, was riding a motorcycle when they were noticed by the police team. While driving the motorcycle, co-accused-Palwinder Singh @ Vicky noticed the police and allegedly threw a polythene envelope; however, same was noticed by a member of the police team. Upon being apprehended, both the individuals

disclosed their identities, namely Palwinder Singh @ Vicky as the driver of the motorcycle and Jasbir Singh @ Khela as the pillion rider. Upon search, 481.50 grams of intoxicant “ice” was recovered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in fact, petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner is 30 years of age and, in his past career, he was never found involved in any other similar activity. Counsel further submits that petitioner is involved as accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement and is in judicial custody for the last 03 months and 04 days. Counsel further submits that out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, one already stands examined as a party witness. No narcotic contraband was recovered from the petitioner. Further argues that other co-accused namely Jasbir Singh @ Khela and Palwinder Singh @ Vicky, from whom there was recovery, have already been granted the concession of regular bail, vide order dated 30.04.2025 (Anenxure P-2) passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-2420-2025 and order dated 02.02.2026 passed by this Court in CRM-M-28900-2025 (Annexure P-1). Thus, prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner also.

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. Main accused namely Jasbir Singh @ Khela and Palwinder Singh

@ Vicky, from whom the alleged recovery was effected, have already been granted the concession of regular bail, vide orders dated 30.04.2025 and 02.02.2026 respectively. Out of a total of 18 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined, and another witness is examined partly. Petitioner is in custody for the period of last 03 months and 04 days; thus, it is evident that the trial is not progressing at the required pace. Additionally, petitioner is not involved in any other similar activity in his past career.

In view of the fact that petitioner being a first-time offender, this Court finds that he deserves another opportunity to rehabilitate himself in society. Accordingly, this Court finds merit in the prayer for bail. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Consequently, 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
accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

30.04.2026

jitender

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