



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

217

Date of decision: 14.01.2026

CRM-M-55481-2025

HUNNY SINGH ALIAS HONEY SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

CRM-M-63045-2025

VISHAL SINGH @ DAKKU

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Varinder Basa, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-55481-2025.

Mr. Atinderpal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
in CRM-M-63045-2025.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The above-mentioned two petitions are being decided by a
common order since they arise out of the same FIR bearing FIR No. 126
dated 01.07.2025, registered under Section(s) 21-B/27-A/29/61/85 of the
Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station

Sector Chheharta, Amritsar, hence, they are being decided by a common order.

2. The brief facts of the present case are that while the police party was on routine patrolling duty, they noticed a young boy approaching on foot from the opposite direction, who on noticing the police, became startled, turned and attempted to flee. In the process, he took out a plastic envelope from the right pocket of his trousers and was about to throw the same, when he was apprehended by the Police officials. He disclosed his name as Hunny Singh @ Honey Singh, son of Sukhchain Singh (Petitioner in CRM-M-55481 of 2025). On search, the substance contained in the plastic envelope was recovered and upon weighing was found to be 110.22 grams of heroin. A sum of Rs. 4,000/- in Indian currency was also recovered from him. In his disclosure statement, he nominated Vishal Singh @ Dakku (Petitioner in CRM-M-63045-2025). Pursuant thereto, a recovery of 135.15 grams of Heroin was also effected from the said accused.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) contend that they are in custody since 01.07.2025 and 03.07.2025 respectively. The recovered quantity is non-commercial and that the investigation in the case is already complete. There are four witnesses cited by the prosecution. None has been examined so far and even the charge is yet to be framed. It is further contended that the petitioner(s) are not involved in any other criminal case.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the period of custody of the petitioners as well as the fact that they are not involved in any other case.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. Taking into consideration the age of the petitioner(s) who are 19 and 22 years old respectively, the quantity of contraband recovered (non-commercial), the period of custody already undergone as well as the stage of trial which is to commence and charges are yet to be framed, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner(s) on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner(s) shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

JANUARY 14, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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