



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

**CRM-M-24129-2026 (O&M)**

Date of Decision: 03.07.2026

MANPREET SINGH ALIAS MOTA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present : Mr. Vipin Kumar Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, D.A.G., Punjab.

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)**

Petitioner-Manpreet Singh alias Mota, aged 34 years, has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the BNSS for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.52 dated 08.04.2025, registered under Sections 21(C), 29, 25 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985 and Section 111 of BNS, at Police Station Cantonment, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 08.04.2025, a team of police officials was present near the back gate of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar in connection with VIP duty. One secret informant came and informed that petitioner-Manpreet Singh alias Mota, Jashanpreet Singh @ Raja and one more person, who are involved in illegal business of

arms and ammunitions, are travelling from India Gate towards Verka bypass in a Swift Dzire car bearing registration No.DL-6-CP-5246 and if an immediate raid is conducted, they all can be apprehended.

When the raid was conducted, it was found that when the petitioner was coming out of the car, one polythene bag fell on the ground and by picking it up, the same was handed over to the police, on which, *heroin* weighing 316 grams was recovered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated as an accused in the present case. In fact, there is no such recovery ever effected from the petitioner and therefore, without following the procedure prescribed under the NDPS Act, the petitioner was arrested in the case. Learned counsel further submits that the investigation is completed and out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date, therefore, prays for grant of bail.

4. Learned State counsel produces the custody certificate dated 01.07.2026 and status report by way of affidavit of Sh. Kamaljit Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, West, Amritsar in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. Copies thereof have been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the bail of the petitioner, submits that the contraband recovered from the possession of the petitioner is commercial and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to concession of bail.

However, on being asked by the Court, learned State counsel makes it clear that the petitioner is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act.

6. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel.

7. At this stage, it cannot be assumed that the recovered contraband is not *heroin* and that too, in commercial quantity. Moreover, the unrebutted fact is that till date, the petitioner is inside the jail for the last about one year, two months and twenty days and is not involved in any other offence under the NDPS Act, except one punishable under the IPC. Recording of evidence is yet to start, therefore, undoubtedly, conclusion of trial is not likely to take place in the near future. For the quantity recovered at the instance of the petitioner, already one year period has been undergone by him inside jail and therefore, not being involved in any other case of similar nature, this Court would like to afford him one opportunity to rehabilitate in the society and to give a chance to himself not to get indulged in future in such like activity.

8. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on 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.

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

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

**July 03, 2026**  
gurpreet

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No