



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-27237-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.05.2026

Manjit Singh @ Bhola

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.42 dated 07.03.2025, registered under Section(s) 21(C) [(Section 29 added later on)] of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Chheharta, District Amritsar.

2. Brief facts of the present case are to the effect that a Police patrolling party apprehended one Joban Singh @ Joban son of Ajit Singh and recovery of 290 grams of *heroin* was effected from his conscious possession. It is contended that the said co-accused nominated 8 other persons as accused, including the present petitioner, and stated that he is an accomplice and used to work for the petitioner for supplying arms and narcotic substances, which were allegedly being sourced by the petitioner from Pakistan.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present FIR was registered on 07.03.2025 and recovery of contraband was effected from one Joban Singh @ Joban, whereas the petitioner was already in custody in another case since 30.12.2024. He contends that even if the allegations as set out in the disclosure by the said accused are accepted as correct, the inference which flows therefrom is that the said co-accused had been working for the petitioner herein, however, the same does not in any manner link the petitioner to the recovery of contraband in question. It is submitted that the petitioner was taken in custody in the present case on 11.03.2025 and no recovery has been effected at his instance or disclosure even after his arrest and detention in the present case. He contends that the investigation in the present case is complete and the charge stands framed and there are total 15 prosecution witnesses. He also submits that the trial is yet to commence.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects, however, he contends that the disclosure of co-accused/Joban Singh @ Joban has been recorded as per which he used to work for the petitioner herein. He is however confronted with the material that has been revealed pursuant to the disclosure and the recoveries that have been effected. He fairly concedes that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner at his disclosure consequent to his arrest in the present case.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner coupled with the fact that there are arguable issues with respect to the involvement of the

petitioner in the present case as also to co-relating the recovery from the co-accused, absence of any recovery during the course of investigation pursuant to the disclosure/confession, the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear 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 hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

19.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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