



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

121

CRM-M-50161-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.03.2026

Ravinder Singh @ Kaka Chitti

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Harmanpreet Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.115 dated 16.06.2024, registered under Sections 21(b) and 21(c) of NDPS Act and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act at Police Station Islamabad, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 01 year, 05 months and 11 days. His name surfaced based on 4th disclosure statement of co-accused. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner, though from co-accused Daljit Kuar and co-accused Gurbaksh Singh @ Lala 50 grams of heroin and 2 kgs of heroin, 1 kg ice powder and 500 grams powder and even from co-accused Arshdeep Singh 200 grams of heroin was recovered, who has been granted bail vide order dated 01.12.2025. Charges have been framed on 10.09.2025 and out of total 26 prosecution witnesses, only 1 has been examined. He is involved in two more cases, wherein he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 14.03.2026, filed by the learned State



counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind the bars for 01 year, 05 months and 11 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner was specifically named by his co-accused, from whom commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case; co-accused enlarged on bail and the petitioner being on bail in other cases.

4. Heard.

5. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court, etc."

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for 01 year, 05 months and 11 days; co-accused is on bail; on bail in other cases; charges were framed on 10.09.2025, out of total 26 prosecution witnesses, only 01 has been examined, the trial is likely to take considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-



- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

16.03.2026

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