



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

**(222)**

**CRM-M-56595-2025**

**DATE OF DECISION: 11.02.2026**

Satnam Singh

.....Petitioner

**VERSUS**

State of U.T, Chandigarh

.....Respondent

**CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present Mr.Abhishek Joon, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. PP, U.T, Chandigarh.

\*\*\*

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)**

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.10 dated 14.04.2025, under Sections 22 & 29 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Crime, Chandigarh.
2. Brief facts of the case are that co-accused Navneet Kaur and Balkar Singh were arrested and 35.17 gms Heroin and an electric weighing scale were recovered from them respectively. During investigation, many other co-accused were arrested and different recoveries at different places were made from them. Present petitioner is alleged to be supplier of recovered contraband and involved in cross border smuggling of Heroin from Pakistan since 2019.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that as per allegations of the prosecution and observation of learned Judge, Special Court, Chandigarh, total contraband recovered is 312.41 gms, however, same cannot be taken into consideration collectively as the recovery is effected from different persons, from different places and on different dates; nothing is recovered from the present petitioner; petitioner is alleged to be



CRM-M-56595-2025

2

supplier of the contraband; he is in custody for the last nine months; petitioner is having no criminal antecedents and is aged about 58 years and regarding the transactions, it is from his son to father and as trial will take sufficient time to conclude, prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. PP, UT, Chandigarh appeared on behalf of respondent/State and filed custody certificate of the petitioner, same is taken on record. Learned State counsel submitted that the present petitioner is supplier of the contraband to different co-accused and total contraband recovered comes under the category of commercial quantity; petitioner also received money from his co-accused but fairly admitted that the contraband was recovered from different co-accused, from different places and on different dates and transaction of money is from his son. Learned counsel contended that petitioner is the supplier and the kingpin, therefore, prayer for dismissal of the petition is made.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that nothing is recovered from the present petitioner; contraband is allegedly recovered from co-accused on different dates, from different persons and from different places which is *intermediate quantity* and it is a moot question whether the contraband recovered was supplied by the petitioner or not; petitioner is in custody for the last more than nine months; he is having clear antecedents as not involved in any other case; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot

CRM-M-56595-2025

3

be decided at the final stage by the trial Court after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides and it is trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

11.02.2026  
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |