



CRM-M-25266-2026

-1-

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

214

CRM-M-25266-2026

Date of decision : 08.05.2026

AMRITPAL SINGH ALIAS BOBBY

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Senior Advocate with
Mr. R.S. Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.44 dated 05.11.2024, under Section 21-C, 22-C, 23 and 29 of the NDPS Act 1985, registered at Police Station Airport Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 05.11.2024, the police apprehended co-accused(s) Karandeep Singh, Jiwan Singh and Manjinder Singh, from whom 1 kg heroin, 1 kg ice drug and an electronic weighing machine were recovered. During the course of investigation, the aforesaid accused suffered disclosure statements to the effect that they were involved in drug peddling along with present petitioner. It is also alleged that the petitioner

**CRM-M-25266-2026****-2-**

was apprehended and an amount of Rs.8,30,000/-, stated to be drug money, was allegedly recovered from him.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been arraigned as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused(s). Besides the disclosure statement(s), there is no incriminating material against the petitioner which would connect him with the alleged offence. It is further submitted that there is non-compliance of mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act and it is yet to be determined as to whether the alleged recovery of the aforesaid amount is connected with drug money or not. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 05 months and 16 days. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as none out of 26 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 05 months and 16 days and none out of 26 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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 01 year, 05 months and 16 days, he was neither named in the FIR nor



CRM-M-25266-2026

-3-

arrested at the spot while having any contraband and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as none out of 26 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of 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 would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

May 08, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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