



CRM-M-42943-2025

-1-

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

111

CRM-M-42943-2025

Date of Decision: 25.03.2026

MANJOT SINGH

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Utkrant Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S.Pandher, Asst. A.G.Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 01 dated 03.01.2025 under Section 21, 21(c), 29 of NDPS Act and 10,11,12 of Air Craft Act, 1934 registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Gurdaspur.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 1 kg of heroin was recovered from the possession of one Jobanpreet Singh, who, during interrogation, suffered a disclosure statement that the petitioner had provided him a WhatsApp number and instructed him to share his location on the said number for the purpose of collecting a consignment of heroin being smuggled from across the border at the instance of one Gurlal Singh, who was operating from abroad.



CRM-M-42943-2025

-2-

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been nominated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Jobanpreet Singh, alleging that he was acting at the behest of the petitioner. It is submitted that no recovery has been effected from the conscious possession of the petitioner. It is further argued that the disclosure statement of a co-accused is inadmissible in evidence and cannot be relied upon as a substantive piece of evidence. Apart from the said disclosure statement, there is no material on record to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 07.03.2025 and prays for grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and the same is taken on record. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 14 days and is not involved in any other case.

5. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions and considering that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 14 days, is not involved in any other case and trial is likely to take considerable time, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served by further incarceration of the



CRM-M-42943-2025

-3-

petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

7. 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 bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

25.03.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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