



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
224

CRM-M-24822-2026
Decided on : 02.07.2026

Dilsher Singh alias Shera . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

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
Dilsher Singh alias Shera	52	08.04.2025	S. 21-C, 29, 25 of NDPS Act, and S. 111 of BNS, 2023.	Cantonment	Amritsar

2. As per case of the prosecution, FIR was registered on 08.04.2025 and from the Swift Dzire car bearing registration No. DL6-CP-5246, recovery of 316 grams of heroin, which was in the transparent polythene bag and lying in the lap of co-accused – Manpreet Singh @ Mota, was recovered. Co-accused – Jashandeep Singh @ Raja, being the owner of the car was driving the same and Manpreet Singh @ Mota was sitting beside the driver and **petitioner – Dilsher Singh alias Shera** was sitting behind the



driver seat.

As per secret information name of the petitioner was not even disclosed, however, on inquiry name of the petitioner was disclosed by him while the accused were apprehended by the members of the police team.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner, is aged about 32 years and never found involved in any other case of similar nature, punishable under the NDPS Act. Rather, the issue of knowledge of conscious possession would be debatable *qua* the petitioner having no knowledge of the contraband while sitting in the rear seat of the car.

Learned counsel submits that had there been any actual involvement of the petitioner in the crime, his name would have been disclosed by the secret informant also while giving information to the raiding police party.

Further submits that petitioner is inside jail for the last more than a period of 01 year, 02 months and 20 days and till date, out of total cited 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined. Thus, learned counsel submits that keeping in view the facts of the case and antecedents of the petitioner, he deserves an opportunity to reform and reintegrate himself in the society. Thus, prays that by taking a lenient view, concession of regular be granted to him.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report and custody certificate dated 01.07.2026 in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. Copies thereof have been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail and



explaining the role attributed to the petitioner, submits that the allegations indicate the petitioner's active involvement in the narcotics trafficking chain. Besides, learned State counsel submits that the offence is serious in nature and attracts stringent punishment and, therefore, warrants custodial trial.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He fairly confirms that petitioner has suffered incarceration inside jail for a period of 01 year, 02 months and 20 days, and also confirms that except the present case, no other case has ever been registered against him. Besides, other factual assertions made here-above have also not been disputed by learned State counsel.

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

7. Admittedly, petitioner is behind bars since 08.04.2025, i.e., for a period of 01 year, 02 months and 20 days, and the trial is moving at a slow pace, therefore, its conclusion is likely to take considerable time. Further, it is noticed that petitioner is a young woman of the age of about 32 years and as per custody certificate, he is not shown to be involved in any other similar activity. Whether the alleged contraband, lying in the lap of co-accused – Manpreet Singh @ Mota, was in knowledge of the petitioner or not, is yet to be established before the learned trial Court during trial. Besides, petitioner is stated to be a first-time offender under the NDPS Act and thus, deserves to be considered on different footings. Keeping in view age of the petitioner, period of custody already undergone, and other circumstances noticed above, this Court deems it appropriate to extend him an opportunity to



reform and rehabilitate herself in society and to join the normal course of life.

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.

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

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 02, 2026

J.Ram

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