

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107

2026:PHHC:053956



CRM-M-49559-2025 (O&M).
Date of decision: 08.04.2026.

RAVINDER SINGH @ RUBI

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

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

PRESENT Mr. Jagandeep Singh Virk, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, AAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.10 dated 09.01.2024, under Section(s) 22 of the Narcotic
Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, and Section(s) 42 and 52-A of
the Prisons Act, (later on charged under Sections 22 and 29 of the NDPS Act
and Section 52-A of the Prisons Act) registered at Police Station City
Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.

Reply on behalf of respondent-State has been filed in the Court

today. A copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel for the petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner was already in prison in another FIR that had been registered against him. He contends that the 1295 tablets of Etizolam, a Lava Mobile phone and two tobacco packets having been thrown above the prison walls was reported on the basis whereof the instant FIR No.10 dated 09.01.2024, was registered against certain unknown persons. He contends that subsequently one Inderjit Singh was arrested on 31.01.2024 in relation to case bearing FIR No.24 dated 14.01.2024, registered under Section 22 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. He suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that he had thrown the said 1295 intoxicant tablets over the prison wall on the asking of the petitioner herein. It was on the basis of the said disclosure statement made by co-accused Inderjit Singh in FIR No.24 dated 14.01.2024 that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present case as well. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 01.02.2024 in this case and thus has undergone an actual custody of more than 02 years in the present case. He further contends that only 05 witnesses have been examined and 05 witnesses have been given up out of 18 witnesses cited by the prosecution.

State counsel does not dispute the facts as noticed above and that 12 witnesses still remain to be examined in the present case. She, however, contends that the petitioner has a history of criminality. She further does not dispute that the petitioner was already in custody when the incident of throwing away of tablets over the prison wall took place and that there was no recovery from the petitioner herein.

I have heard counsel appearing for the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended along with the present petition.

Taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, his nomination as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, absence of recovery from the petitioner, the stage of the trial as well as the period of custody already undergone by him, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

April 08, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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