



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

139-2

CRM-M-50587-2025
Decided on : 26.02.2026

Vishavjit Singh @ Vishu . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Vikram Satpal Anand, 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
Vishavjit Singh @ Vishu	13	03.03.2025	21(C), 27 of NDPS Act, 1985 and 111 of BNS, 2023 [S. 29 of NDPS Act, 1985, added later on]	Verka	District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar

2. As per allegations in FIR, accused Preet Kamal @ Kalu and Pardeep Singh @ Waccha, while together, were intercepted by police party on basis of secret information, and heroin weighing 140 grams was recovered from possession of Preet Kamal @ Kalu and 130 grams from possession of Pardeep Singh @ Waccha.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argues that after two days of arrest of accused Preet Kamal @ Kalu on 05.03.2025, name of petitioner was introduced in present case.



Further argues that on the date of recovery, i.e., 03.03.2025, as well as on date of disclosure statement of co-accused, petitioner was already in custody in another case. Even after his arrest in present case, no recovery of narcotic contraband has been effected from his possession.

4. Learned counsel submits that petitioner is in custody since 17.03.2025, i.e. for a period of about 11 months and 08 days, and trial has not yet commenced, therefore, its conclusion is likely to take considerable time. Further submits that though there are four other cases against petitioner, however, he already stands admitted to bail in all such cases. For reference, details thereof are as under:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>FIR No./Date</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
1.	<i>FIR No.18, dated 15.03.2025</i>	<i>Allowed</i>
2.	<i>FIR No.45, dated 12.03.2020</i>	<i>Allowed on 29.03.2020</i>
3.	<i>FIR No. 254, dated 11.08.2023</i>	<i>Allowed on 20.09.2023</i>
4.	<i>FIR No. 76, dated 23.09.2024</i>	<i>Allowed on 26.09.2025</i>

Thus, learned counsel submits that in view of above, petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail, especially when he has already undergone substantial incarceration.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel though vehemently opposes the prayer for bail, but he is unable to dispute that factual assertions as made here-above and noticed in the foregoing paragraphs.

6. Considering submissions made by learned counsel for parties and material available on record, it is not disputed that petitioner has not been named in FIR and has been implicated subsequently on basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. It is also a matter of record that on date of recovery as well as at time of disclosure statement, petitioner was already



in custody in another case. Admittedly, no recovery of any narcotic contraband has been effected from his possession.

Besides, it is noticeable that petitioner is in custody since 17.03.2025, i.e. for a period of about 11 months and 08 days, and trial has not yet commenced. Thus, conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

7. Although petitioner is stated to be involved in other cases, but he already stands admitted to bail in all such cases. Further, petitioner is a young person of 25 years who has already remained in custody for a considerable period; this Court finds it appropriate to extend to him an opportunity to reform and rehabilitate himself in society and to rejoin the normal course of life.

8. Therefore, without commenting upon merits of case, and taking into consideration overall facts and circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to petitioner.

Consequently, the prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is directed to remain on bail in the instant case and is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing fresh 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. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an



expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

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 26, 2026
J.Ram

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