



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-24775-2026
Decided on : 02.07.2026

Yogesh Kumar @ Bhalla . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. S.K. Choudhary, Advocate (through V.C.)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Hardip Singh.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Yogesh Kumar @ Bhalla	20	09.02.2026	S. 21-61-85 of NDPS Act, 1985 (S. 29 of NDPS Act, 1985)	Division No.1	Pathankot

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and his name surfaced only on the basis of the second disclosure statement of the main accused Sahil @ Kalu @ Singham, from whose possession recovery of 6.00 grams of heroin was effected. It is further submitted that no recovery of any narcotic contraband has been effected from the petitioner.



Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is a young person aged about 24 years and that a disclosure statement, by itself, is a weak piece of evidence, the evidentiary value whereof is to be tested during the course of trial. Accordingly, it is prayed that keeping in view the fact that the implication of the petitioner rests solely upon the disclosure statement of the co-accused and no recovery has been effected from him, he deserves to be extended the concession of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 01.07.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to learned counsel for petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has been implicated on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the main accused – Sahil @ Kalu @ Singham, from whose possession 6.00 grams of heroin was recovered. Besides, petitioner is also involved in many other cases, out of which, some are under the NDPS Act.

However, learned State counsel candidly admits that no recovery of any narcotic contraband has been effected from the petitioner and his implication rests solely upon the second disclosure statement of the main accused. Besides, other factual assertions noticed here-above have not been disputed by learned State counsel.

5. In rebuttal, learned counsel for petitioner submits that though petitioner is shown to be involved in certain other criminal cases, at present,



he is on bail in most of the cases. Besides, it is also noticeable that all those cases pertain to same Police Station, which, according to learned counsel for petitioner, in fact, shows his false implication.

6. I have heard learned counsel for parties and perused relevant material available on record.

7. Admittedly, petitioner has been implicated only on basis of second disclosure statement of main accused Sahil @ Kalu @ Singham, from whose possession recovery of 6.00 grams of heroin was effected. No recovery of any narcotic contraband has been effected from petitioner. At this stage, disclosure statement by itself is a weak piece of evidence, evidentiary value whereof is required to be tested during course of trial by leading cogent and substantive evidence.

It is also noticeable that petitioner is aged about 24 years. Though he is shown to be involved in certain other criminal cases, learned counsel for petitioner has submitted that he has already been granted bail in most of cases. Mere pendency of those cases, at this stage, cannot be made sole ground to decline concession of regular bail in present case.

8. Therefore, without commenting upon merits of case, and keeping in view facts and circumstances noticed here-above as well as settled principles governing grant of bail, this Court deems it appropriate to extend concession of regular bail to 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. 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.

11. 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.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 02, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No