



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH**

119

CRM-M-55582-2025
Date of Decision: 12.03.2026

AKASHDEEP SINGH @ AKASH

... Petitioner

VERSUS**STATE OF PUNJAB**

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

**********VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

1. This second petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.58 dated 10.07.2024 under Section 21(c) of the NDPS Act, 1985 (Sections 25 and 29 of the Act added later on) registered at Police Station Sadar Valtoha, District Tarn Taran after the withdrawal of first petition vide order dated 05.05.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the version of the prosecution, co-accused, namely Vishal Singh and Amandeep Singh, were apprehended red handed while being in possession of 502 and 479 grams of heroin respectively, without any permit or licence on 10.07.2024. On the basis of disclosure statements made by them, the petitioner herein was nominated as an accused for the commission of offence punishable under Section 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested by the

respondents on 04.06.2024 in another case under the NDPS Act and that he was already in custody when the recovery in question had been effected. Counsel further contends that the petitioner has been nominated in the present case solely because the co-accused were using a car, which was owned by the petitioner. He thus contends that the petitioner cannot be held liable for the acts committed by the abovenamed co-accused persons by misusing the car that belonged to him and that too when he was already in custody in some other case. He further contends that the petitioner is behind bars in the present case since 11.12.2024 and has already undergone a custody of more than 01 year and 02 months. He further contends that the conclusion of trial is likely to take long time as only two witnesses out of fifteen have been examined till date.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that the name of the petitioner cropped up in the present case on the basis of disclosure statements made by the abovenamed co-accused persons and solely because they recovered a Brezza Car bearing Registration No.PB-11DF-5678 which was registered in the name of the present petitioner. It is also not disputed that the petitioner was already in custody when the contraband was recovered from the abovenamed co-accused and they were arrested by the police and that no recovery of any nature had been effected from or at the instance of the petitioner. The stage of the trial has also not been disputed by the learned State Counsel.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the averments made by the counsel for the respective parties, the attribution to the petitioner and absence of recovery from him as well as the stage of trial, I deem it appropriate to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.
7. 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.
8. The observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MARCH 12, 2026.
Monika

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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