



CRM-M-30929-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

232

CRM-M-30929-2025
Decided on : 03.02.2026

SAJANPREET SINGH ALIAS SAJAN

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. K.S. Kahlon, Advocate, and
Ms. Manveen Kahlon, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Iqbalpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Petitioner – Sajanpreet Singh alias Sajan has filed present petition, under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.18 dated 26.02.2025 registered under Sections 21-C and 29 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran.

Contentions addressed on behalf of the petitioner

(i) Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, as per the allegations, on 26.02.2025, members of the police party had laid a *naka* at village Narli Drain. After some time, a car carrying four occupants was noticed approaching the *naka*. Upon seeing the police party, two persons, sitting on the left side of the car (one on the front passenger seat and the other on the rear seat), attempted to throw polythene bags from their hands. They were apprehended on the spot. The person sitting on the front passenger seat disclosed his name as Lovepreet Singh @ Labba,



while the person sitting behind him disclosed his name as Gurlal Singh. From the polythene bag allegedly thrown by Lovepreet Singh @ Labba, 255 grams of heroin was recovered, whereas 254 grams of heroin was recovered from the polythene bag thrown by Gurlal Singh. The vehicle was being driven by Sajanpreet Singh (petitioner herein), and the fourth occupant, namely Gurjant Singh @ Janty, was sitting behind the driver.

(ii) Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no recovery has been effected from the personal possession of the petitioner. It is contended that petitioner's alleged role is limited to driving the car in which the other accused persons, who were in personal possession of the recovered contraband of heroin, were travelling together.

Learned counsel submits that the core issue before the trial Court would be whether the petitioner was in conscious possession of the contraband, which was allegedly attempted to be discarded by the other two co-accused from their own possession. It is argued that this aspect can only be adjudicated at the final stage of the trial.

(iii) It is further contended that the mere act of driving the vehicle does not, by itself, establish that petitioner had any prior knowledge of, or nexus with, the contraband allegedly found in the possession of the other occupants of the vehicle.

(iv) Learned counsel further argues that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, as no recovery whatsoever has been effected from his possession. It is also submitted that he has been arrayed as an accused only to inflate the number of accused persons,



particularly as he is already known to the police on account of his alleged involvement in two other NDPS cases.

(v) Furthermore, counsel for the petitioner submits that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined till date. Thus, culmination of trial is likely to consume considerable time. It is also submitted that similarly situated co-accused, namely Gurjant Singh alias Janty, has also been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 13.01.2026, passed in CRM-M-56100-2025. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

Contentions addressed on behalf of the State

(i) In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate of the petitioner dated 02.02.2026 in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

(ii) As per the custody certificate, petitioner has already undergone incarceration for a period of 10 months and 29 days.

(iii) While opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner in the present case, learned State counsel submits that if concession of bail is extended to the petitioner, there is every likelihood of influencing the prosecution witnesses, disturbance of law and order, and a reasonable apprehension that petitioner may indulge in similar offences in the future.

(iv) Learned State counsel further contends that the offence allegedly committed by the petitioner is not against an individual but is



an offence against society at large and, therefore, his bail petition deserves dismissal. However, learned State counsel is unable to point out any corroborative evidence, such as telephonic communication or a money trail between the parties, having been collected by the investigating agency.

Conclusion

(i) This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

(ii) In view of the totality of the circumstances, nature of the facts and allegations levelled against the petitioner, factors noticed here above, and the period of incarceration already undergone by him, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to him.

(iii) 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.

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

(v) 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.



CRM-M-30929-2025 5

(vi) 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.

(vii) Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

03.02.2026
Lavisha

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