



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

123

1)

CRM-M-53629-2025
Decided on : 19.02.2026

Rajvir Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

2)

CRM-M-57545-2025

Rajvir Singh @ Kajama @ Rataneshwar Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Simranjit Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-53629-2025).

Mr. J.S. Jaidka, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-57545-2025).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-53629-2025 & CRM-M-57545-2025, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-53629-2025.
2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have 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
Rajvir Singh in CRM-M-53629-2025	144	02.07.2024	21, 21(C), 29, 27(a), 61 of NDPS Act, 1985 & 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959	Jamalpur	Ludhiana
Rajvir Singh @	144	02.07.2024	21, 21-C, 29, 27-A, 61 of	Jamalpur	District Police

Kajama @ Rataneshwar Singh (petitioner in CRM-M- 57545-2025)			NDPS Act, 1985 & 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959		Commissionerate, Ludhiana
--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------

3. As per case of the prosecution, one secret information was received in regard to the involvement of accused Ishar Singh, Rajvir Singh @ Kajama (petitioner in CRM-M-57545-2025), and Rajvir Singh s/o Gurdeep Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-53629-2025) that they are involved in the illegal business of smuggling of heroin and use to share money. Further, it was informed that all of them are going together on foot from the house of Rajvir Singh Ukar to supply heroin to their customers and if raid is conducted, they all can be arrested.

On the basis of said information, and notwithstanding that no actual recovery had yet been effected, the FIR in question was registered in the present case against all the three named accused.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that during investigation accused were intercepted and on search 300 grams of heroin was effected from the possession of the main accused – Ishar Singh, however, no narcotic contraband or the drug was recovered from the possession of both the petitioners, i.e., Rajvir Singh s/o Gurdeep Singh and Rajvir Singh @ Kajama @ Rataneshwar Singh. However, in addition from the possession of the petitioner – Rajvir Singh @ Kajama @ Rataneshwar Singh, two pistols along with cartridges were allegedly recovered and from possession of another petitioner – Rajvir Singh s/o Gurdeep Singh, a cash amount of Rs.1,97,000/- of Indian currency, one electric scale along with 50 empty polythene pouches were shown to be recovered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner - Rajvir Singh @ Kajama @ Rataneshwar Singh, submits that petitioner is of the age of 25 years and in

his past carrier, he is never shown to be involved in any other case of similar nature and his antecedents are clear. The narcotic contraband has been recovered from the possession of the main accused, i.e., Ishar Singh in the present case.

Further submits that for recovery of two pistols and cartridges, the petitioner cannot be tried under the NDPS Act; rather, if at all the allegations are found to be correct, the same would constitute a separate offence under the Arms Act. Accordingly, he prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. While addressing arguments qua petitioner – Rajvir Singh s/o Gurdeep Singh, learned counsel submits that the petitioner is a Non-Resident Indian (NRI) residing in Canada. He is aged about 43 years and has never been found indulged in any criminal activity in the past. However, learned counsel submits that on account of his implication in another criminal case, i.e., FIR No.136 dated 30.03.2023, and due to the alleged demand of bribe by the concerned Investigating Officer, which the petitioner refused to pay, he has been falsely implicated in the present case.

It is further submitted that the cash amount allegedly recovered from the petitioner is not the subject matter of the NDPS Act, and no contraband or narcotic substance has been recovered from his possession.

7. On the other hand, learned State counsel, though sought time to file the status report, however, this Court is not inclined to grant any further time, as it was expected from the Investigating Officer to remain present in Court at the time of hearing, in case the status report was not available on record.

However, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificates dated 18.02.2026 in both the cases, in Court today. Same are taken on

record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

Copies thereof have been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioners.

8. Heard.

9. Considering the overall circumstances of the case and the submissions addressed by learned counsel for both sides, this Court finds no justifiable reason to decline the prayer for bail made by the petitioners through the present petitions. It is also noticeable that challan was submitted on 19.12.2024 and charges were framed on 18.02.2025, however, out of total cited 14 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. The petitioners are in custody since 02.07.2024, i.e., for a period of about 01 year, 07 months and 12 days as on 18.02.2026.

Thus, it is evident that the trial proceedings are presently at a standstill, as even the examination of prosecution witnesses has not commenced, and therefore, the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Accordingly, in the given facts and circumstances, this Court does not deem it appropriate to further curtail the personal liberty of the petitioners for an indefinite period.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

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

11. 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.

12. It is also clarified that in case any of the factual submissions made on behalf of the petitioners is found to be incorrect, it shall be open for the State to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

Petitions stand disposed of.

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

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 19, 2026

J.Ram

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