



CRM-M-29975-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

221

**CRM-M-29975-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 29.05.2026**

RAVI KUMAR ALIAS BABLU**.....Petitioner**

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Harpreet S. Rakhra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Navreet Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS') seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.41 dated 19.03.2026 (Annexure P-1), under sections 21(B), 27(A) and 25 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short - 'the NDPS Act') registered at Police Station Division - A, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar Punjab.

2. Allegations qua the petitioner are that patrolling party apprehended him alongwith co-accused, namely, Harjit Singh and 12 grams of heroin was recovered from the petitioner, and Rs.19,000/- drug money and a car was recovered from co-accused Harjit Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for grant of concession of regular bail on the following grounds:



- (I) the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case;
 - (II) the allegedly recovered contraband i.e. 12 grams of heroin falls under the category of intermediate quantity;
 - (III) the petitioner has been in custody since 23.03.2026 i.e. for the last 02 months and 05 days;
 - (IV) the petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case;
 - (V) trial is likely to take long time, as such, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.
4. Notice of motion.
5. Custody certificate dated 28.05.2026 of the petitioner has been filed by learned State counsel and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has been behind bars since 23.03.2026 i.e. for about 02 months and 05 days.
6. On advance notice, Ms. Navreet Kaur, AAG, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the grant of concession of regular bail on the ground that the petitioner was apprehended by the patrolling party and contraband, i.e. 12 grams of heroin was recovered from his possession.

It is, however, fairly admitted that the quantity of the contraband involved in the present case falls under the category of intermediate quantity and the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case and the petitioner has been in custody for the last 02 months and 05 days.



Learned State counsel further submitted that petitioner has been remanded to judicial custody and he is not required for any investigation purpose.

7. Heard.

8. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the present case, the rival contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court finds merit in the present petition on the following aspects:

- (I) the petitioner has been in custody since 23.03.2026 i.e. for the last 02 months and 05 days;
- (II) the recovered contraband i.e. 12 grams of heroin falls under the category of intermediate quantity;
- (III) as submitted by learned State counsel, the petitioner has been remanded to judicial custody and is not required for any investigation purpose;
- (IV) petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents, and is not involved in any other case; and
- (V) trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period;

8. Concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties and it is a trite principle of



criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. It is made clear that in case the petitioner indulges in offence under the provisions of the NDPS Act, after his release on bail, the State is at liberty to file an appropriate application for cancellation of his bail.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

29.05.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO