



CRM-M-58416-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

143

CRM-M-58416-2025  
Decided on : 24.03.2026

Gurlal Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate,  
Mr. Mittardeep Singh, Advocate and  
Mr. Himanshu Badoga, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG Punjab

\*\*\*\*

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

| Name of Petitioner(s)       | FIR No. | Date       | Section(s)                                                                                                | Police Station | District   |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Gurlal Singh, aged 23 years | 28      | 07.03.2024 | Sections 10, 11, 12 of Aircraft Act, 1934 and Section 21C/29/61/85 of NDPS Act and Section 379/411 of IPC | Khalra         | Tarn Taran |

2. The following contention was recorded on 28.11.2025 :

*1. These petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s), during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First*



Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

| Name of Petitioner(s)                                             | FIR No. | Date       | Section(s)                                                                                               | Police Station | District   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| (i) Lovedeep Singh, aged 26 years (petitioner in CRM-M-3834-2025) | 28      | 07.03.2024 | 10, 11, 12 of the Aircraft Act, 1934, Sections 21-C and 29 of the NDPS Act, and Sections 379 abd 411 IPC | Khalra         | Tarn Taran |
| (ii) Gurlal Singh, aged 23 years (petitioner in CRM-M-58416-2025) |         |            |                                                                                                          |                |            |

2. As per prosecution version, during joint operation conducted by the police and personnel of Border Security Force, on 06.03.2024 one Pakistan origin assembled agriculture drone (Quadcopter) was recovered near BP No. 138/27, which was taken into possession and FIR for the offences under the Aircraft Act, 1934 was registered. Next day, i.e. 07.03.2024, during search of the nearby area, no objectionable article was found. Later on, on the basis of information received from special informer, Lovepreet Singh and Gurlal Singh (petitioners herein) were apprehended, and from their possession total 780 grams of Heroin, i.e. 500 grams from Gurlal Singh and 280 grams from Lovepreet, was recovered.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submit that as per the FIR version, nothing objectionable, except the drone, was recovered from the spot. There is no evidence to link the present petitioner(s) with the alleged drone and recovery of 780 grams of Heroin. The entire story is cooked up, and mentioned for the first time in the challan. The petitioner(s) are in custody since 07.03.2024.
4. Learned State counsel seeks some time to file a comprehensive status report in both cases be filed detailing therein role of both the petitioners and the evidences collected by the prosecution during investigation as well as antecedents of the petitioners.
5. List again on 02.02.2026.
- Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.”

3. While producing copy of order dated 15.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-3834-2025, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that co-accused Lovedeep

**CRM-M-58416-2025****3**

Singh, from whom Heroin weighing 280 grams was recovered has also been released on bail and on that account plea of the petitioner can also be considered by releasing him on bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner also points out that in the cited order of co-accused at several places name of accused Lovedeep Singh has been incorrectly recorded as Lovepreet Singh, whereas actual name is Lovedeep Singh. He also argues that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined and due to slow pace of the trial, it is the petitioner, who is suffering the most, lying inside jail for the last more than a period of 02 years. Thus, prays for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel while countering the submissions submits that commercial quantity has been recovered from possession of the petitioner, which is almost double to the maximum of non-commercial quantity, therefore, considering the bail order dated 15.12.2025 qua Lovedeep Singh, petitioner can not be benefited by applying the principle of parity. However, being asked by the Court, learned State counsel confirms the fact that the petitioner, who is aged 23 years, was never found indulged in his past career in any other similar activity and in the present case for 02 years, 11 days period, he is inside jail, without proving of the charge.

5. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available before it.

6. Considering all the circumstances and the fact that the trial is moving at a very slow pace and the petitioner being first time offender under NDPS Act, requires to be rehabilitate in the society, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail of the petitioner.

**CRM-M-58416-2025****4**

7. Consequently, prayer made in the 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.

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

9. 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.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

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

**March 24, 2026***reena*

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

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE**