



208

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32946-2026
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026

GURVINDER SINGH @ GURBINDER SINGH @ RINKU
.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Ms. K.K. Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG Punjab

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under section 483 of B.N.S.S., 2023(439 of Cr.P.C.) for grant of Regular Bail to the Petitioner in FIR No.152 dated 23.06.2019, under Section 22 & 25 of NDPS Act 1985, registered at Police Station Sardulgarh, District Mansa, Punjab (Annexure P-1), during the pendency of the trial.

2. Contentions:

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the petitioner had earlier been granted the concession of bail during the pendency of the trial. However, owing to unavoidable circumstances, he could not appear before the learned Trial Court on 08.08.2025, which led to the cancellation of his bail and surety bonds and the issuance of non-bailable warrants against him. Learned counsel further submits that, subsequently, the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender vide order dated 24.10.2025.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to which, the petitioner has been incarcerated for a period of 1 month and 6 days.

Learned State Counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail stating that recovery of 16 strips total 160 intoxicant capsules of PARVORIN-SPAS containing salt of Tramadol Hydrochloride was recovered from the petitioner.

3. Analysis

Considering the fact that the State has failed to point out any cogent incriminating material connecting the petitioner with the alleged contraband and further that even the quantity of the contraband was not known at the time of registration of the FIR, which prima facie casts a serious doubt on the prosecution version, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out a case for the grant of regular bail.

4. Relief:

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.06.2026*Meenu***(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE**

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