



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

129

CRM-M-49462-2025
Decided on : 24.02.2026

Gurnoor Singh @ Noor . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, 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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurnoor Singh @ Noor	31	15.02.2025	18, 27(a), 29 of NDPS Act, 1985	Chheharta	Amritsar

2. As per case of the prosecution, from the possession of the main accused, namely, Malwinder Singh @ Sonu, 2 kg 300 grams of opium along with Rs.20,000/- as drug money were recovered. On the basis of his disclosure statement, two other accused were nominated, namely, Manjinder Singh @ Sony, from whose possession 50 grams of opium were recovered. The second name disclosed by the main accused was that of the present petitioner – Gurnoor Singh @ Noor, who, after being arrested on 19.02.2025, is in custody. However, no recovery was effected from him



during investigation.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after completion of investigation, challan was presented on 13.08.2025 and thereafter, charges were framed on 23.09.2025. However, the process of recording of statements of the prosecution witnesses is yet to commence. Thus, he prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 22.02.2026 and custody certificate dated 23.02.2026 in Court today. Both are taken on record. Office to tag the same at the appropriate place. Copies thereof have been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner is involved in seven other cases apart from the present one, and thus, he is a habitual offender under the NDPS Act and does not deserve any leniency.

At this stage, in response to the said objection, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to his previous involvement in cases, he is being falsely implicated time and again, as he is already known to the local police officials.

6. I have considered the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

7. At the outset, it is relevant to note that the main accused, namely, Malwinder Singh @ Sonu, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 07.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-33078-2025, titled as "*Malwinder Singh alias*



Sonu v. State of Punjab” (Annexure P-3).

Besides, another co-accused, namely, Manjinder Singh @ Sony, from whose possession 50 grams of opium was recovered, has also been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 27.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-19928-2025 (O&M), titled as “*Manjinder Singh alias Sony v. State of Punjab*” (Annexure P-4).

It is further noticed that the process of recording of statements of prosecution witnesses has not yet commenced. Merely on the basis of involvement in other cases, the liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed, particularly when the co-accused, who are attributed with more serious allegations, have already been granted the concession of regular bail.

8. Therefore, keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing anything on the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail of the petitioner.

Consequently, 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.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on



the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

11. 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.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 24, 2026
J.Ram

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