



CRM-M-56988-2025

1

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

318

**CRM-M-56988-2025  
Decided on :11.02.2026**

Pushpinder Singh @ Honey

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Puneet Singh, Advocate for  
Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, Asst. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, seeking regular bail in FIR No. 0108 dated 22.08.2024, under Sections 22 and 29 (added subsequently) and 61 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Urban Estate, Patiala.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, while the police patrolling team had established a naka and were conducting checks of incoming and outgoing vehicles, a motorcycle bearing registration No. PB-11-BV-8002, make Splendor, was noticed. One Amrit Verma was pillion rider on the said motorcycle, which was being driven by co-accused, Hemantpreet Singh. Police also observed a black-colored bag placed between the two riders. Upon signaling the motorcycle to stop, co-accused immediately turned the motorcycle sharply to the left, causing it to skid and collide with a wall. As a result, both Hemantpreet Singh and Amrit Verma fell

**CRM-M-56988-2025****2**

onto the road. In their attempt to flee from the spot, both were apprehended. Upon search, 870 tablets of Plus Parvion Spas containing salt tramadol were recovered from the polythene bag lying between them on the motorcycle.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Counsel further submits that the name of the petitioner has surfaced solely on the basis of disclosure statements made by co-accused Amrit Verma and Hemantpreet Singh, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 29.08.2025(P-4) and 23.09.2025(P-5), passed in CRM-M-46845-2025 and CRM-M-52461-2025, respectively. Counsel submits that petitioner is in custody since 01.04.2025 and, out of a total of 12 prosecution witnesses, only 3 have been examined so far, meaning thereby that, the trial is likely to take considerable time.

Counsel also relies on the principle of parity, submitting that since co-accused in similar circumstances have already been granted regular bail, the petitioner is entitled to the same relief. Accordingly, he prays for the grant of regular bail.

4. While opposing the prayer for bail, learned State counsel submits that petitioner was in constant contact with the main accused, from whom 870 tablets were recovered, and is alleged to have played an active role in the alleged offence. He further submits that petitioner is reportedly involved in another case of a similar nature, indicating a

**CRM-M-56988-2025****3**

pattern of involvement in illegal activities. Thus, prays for the dismissal of the present petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto, including the status report.

6. Considering the facts that; the petitioner is in custody since 01.04.2025; that his name has surfaced solely on the basis of disclosure statements of co-accused who have already been granted regular bail; that out of a total of 12 prosecution witnesses only 3 have been examined so far, and that the trial is likely to take considerable time, this Court finds merit in the prayer for bail.

Consequently, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his 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.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.



CRM-M-56988-2025

4

9.                   Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

11.02.2026  
*Rashmi*

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