



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

112

CRM-M-44612-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.03.2026

Mandeep Singh @ Mani

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.61 dated 16.05.2024 registered under Sections 21(C), 25, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 489 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 added later on), at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran.

2. As per the prosecution, on 16.05.2024, petitioner was apprehended alongwith his co-accused/Gurtaj Singh @ Taj and recovery of 1 kg of *heroin* was effected from their conscious possession. He contends that co-accused/Satnam Singh was also arrayed as an accused in the present case vide DDR No.18 dated 18.05.2024 and an additional 500 grams of *heroin* was recovered from his possession as well.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 16.05.2024 and has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 01 year and 9 months and only 03 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. He contends that the

petitioner has no criminal antecedents and no further purpose would be served by his custodial detention.

4. Learned State counsel on the other hand contends that recovery of 1 kg of *heroin* was effected from conscious possession of the petitioner and his co-accused/Gurtaj Singh @ Taj, which falls under the category of commercial quantity and they have thus committed an offence punishable under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. It is contended that 03 out of 14 prosecution witnesses stand examined and thus it cannot be said that the trial is being inordinately delayed. He further contends that the bail petition of co-accused/Gurtaj Singh @ Taj i.e. CRM-M-73966-2025, stands dismissed as withdrawn from this Court vide order dated 26.02.2026.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the documents available on record.

6. Undisputedly, 1 kg. of *Heroin* has been recovered jointly from the petitioner and his co-accused. The recovered quantity is commercial and 4 times the prescribed commercial quantity. Three witnesses have already been examined, hence, it cannot be said that trial is inordinately delayed. The period of custody cannot be said to be excessive. A minimum sentence of 10 years is prescribed for the offence. Besides, bail of identically placed co-accused was dismissed as withdrawn on 26.02.2026. There is no ground for treating the case of the petitioner on any different footing.

7. Consequently, the present petition is also ***dismissed***.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

05.03.2026

Mangal Singh

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