



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH  
215

CRM-M-30106-2026  
Decided on : 29.05.2026

Swaranjit Singh @ Sony . . . Petitioner(s)  
Versus  
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Yaseen Sethi, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).  
  
Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, 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 |
|------------------------|---------|------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Swaranjit Singh @ Sony | 68      | 25.03.2026 | S. 21 & 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 | City Khanna-1  | Ludhiana |

2. As per case of prosecution, at about 9:20 PM on 25.03.2026, when a police party was searching for suspicious persons at T-point, ID Banquet Hall, in front of Vridh Ashram, G.T. Road, Khanna, a signal was given to stop a car bearing registration No. PB26-H-7721, occupied by two persons. However, they got panicked and attempted to flee, but with the assistance of other police officials, Investigating Officer succeeded in



apprehending them. The person driving the vehicle disclosed his name as Jatin Saggu, whereas the other occupant, sitting on the front passenger seat, disclosed his name as Abhishek Garg.

On searching the vehicle, a transparent envelope was noticed near the gear lever and, upon weighing, it was found that the envelope along with the polythene bag weighed 10 grams and contained heroin.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argues that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in present case. Allegations levelled in FIR are inherently improbable, as it does not appeal to reason that such a small quantity of contraband would be kept in a polythene bag in an open manner and at a place easily accessible to all occupants of the vehicle.

It is further argued that co-accused, namely Jatin Saggu, who was driving the vehicle and is similarly situated, has already been ordered to be released on bail, by trial Court vide order dated 08.04.2026 (P-2).

4. Learned counsel submits that allegation against petitioner is that his name (Swaranjit Singh @ Sony) as well as that of co-accused Taranpreet Singh @ Tikli, surfaced on the basis of disclosure statements allegedly suffered by named accused in FIR, namely Jatin Saggu and Abhishek Garg. Thereafter, both subsequently nominated accused were arrested on 26.03.2026 and, as per prosecution allegations, 7 grams of heroin was recovered from personal search of petitioner, whereas 10 grams of heroin was recovered from co-accused Taranpreet Singh @ Tikli.

It is, thus, argued that quantity allegedly recovered from petitioner is only two grams in excess of small quantity and, for said allegation, petitioner is inside the jail for a period of more than two months.



Insofar as other cases stated to have been registered against petitioner are concerned, i.e., (i) FIR No.48 of 2021, Police Station Ahmedgarh, and (ii) FIR No.30 of 2025 under Section 27 of NDPS Act, Police Station Payal, same have no bearing upon present case, as petitioner has not been convicted in any of aforesaid cases till date. Rather, according to learned counsel, petitioner has been falsely implicated in present case as well.

Thus, in the given facts & circumstances, learned counsel seeks concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 28.05.2026, in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has been specifically nominated during the course of investigation and a recovery of 7 grams of heroin has been effected from his personal search. It is further submitted that the petitioner is also involved in two other cases, including one under the NDPS Act, and therefore, does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

However, learned State counsel fairly concedes that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and came to be implicated subsequently during investigation on the basis of disclosure statement. He also does not dispute that co-accused Jatin Saggu has already been granted concession of regular bail by the learned trial Court vide order dated 08.04.2026. Other



factual assertions, as noticed here-above, have also not been controverted by learned State counsel.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after considering the material available on record, this Court finds that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and his name surfaced subsequently during the course of investigation. It is also not disputed that the quantity allegedly recovered from the personal search of the petitioner is 7 grams of heroin, which is only marginally above the prescribed small quantity under the NDPS Act.

It is further noticeable that one of the named accused in the FIR, namely, Jatin Saggu, who was allegedly present in the vehicle at the time of recovery of 10 grams of heroin, has already been granted concession of regular bail by the learned trial Court.

So far as the other criminal cases reflected in the custody certificate are concerned, admittedly, no conviction has been recorded against the petitioner in either of the said cases till date. Mere pendency of criminal cases, in the absence of any finding of guilt, cannot by itself constitute a ground to deny concession of bail.

Besides, It is also noticeable that petitioner is inside the jail since 26.03.2026. Investigation stands completed and thus, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for an indefinite period, particularly when the allegations levelled against him are yet to be established during the course of trial.

8. Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case and taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances, this Court



deems it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

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.

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

10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. 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.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

**May 29, 2026**

*J.Ram*

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