

CRM-M-34807-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-34807-2025
Decided on : 12.02.2026

Karandeep Singh alias Karan

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG 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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Karandeep Singh @ Karan	43	13.03.2024	21 and 29 of NDPS (Section 21 replaced with Section 21-C of NDPS Act) and Section 25 of Arms Act	STF	SAS Nagar

2. On the basis of secret information, and prior to apprehending the accused or recovering any narcotic contraband or weapons, the FIR in question was registered against total three accused persons namely (i) Karandeep Singh alias Karan (petitioner herein), (ii) Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanju and (iii) Naina Sharma. During the course of investigation, one pistol .32 bore alongwith six live



CRM-M-34807-2025

cartridges was recovered from the possession of the petitioner, who was driving the car bearing registration No. DL-8C-AW-9177 (make: Swift, colour: white). Additionally, 400 grams of heroin was recovered from beneath the driver's seat of the car.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is inside jail since the registration of the FIR i.e. 13.03.2024 and after completion of investigation, challan was submitted and charges were framed on 09.07.2024 and till date, only three prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total 14 witnesses. Other two co-accused namely Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanju and Naina Sharma have already been released on regular bail vide order dated 26.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-36166-2025 (copy produced and taken on record) and vide order dated 14.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-13863-2025 (Annexure P-3) respectively. Thus, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that complete control of the car was with the petitioner, in which the narcotic contraband i.e. Heroin 400 grams was recovered. He also submits that, petitioner is also accused in one more case i.e. FIR No. 152 dated 02.09.2021 registered under Section 21c, 25, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act at Police Station STF, however, he does not deny the fact that petitioner has already been released on bail in the said case. Thus, prays for dismissal of bail.

5. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available before it.

6. In the light of the facts and circumstances of the present case, as noticed here-above, and also keeping in view the observations made by this Court

**CRM-M-34807-2025**

in the case of the similarly situated co-accused, this Court finds no justifiable ground to deny the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. The matter is still at the stage of trial, and the final determination of guilt or otherwise can be arrived at only after the prosecution evidence is led and tested in accordance with law. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose.

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.

7. Needless to observe 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 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.

9. 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.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 12, 2026

reena

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