



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

122-1

CRM-M-59059-2025
Decided on : 19.03.2026

Angrej Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, 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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Angrej Singh	126	31.07.2024	21(c), 29 & 27-A of NDPS Act, 1985	Chheharta	District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 31.07.2024, on the basis of secret information, the main accused, namely Gurmej Singh, was intercepted by the crime patrolling team and from his possession, 3.534 kg of heroin was recovered.

After the arrest of accused Gurmej Singh, his disclosure statement was recorded, wherein it was stated that 2.00 kg of heroin had been delivered to him by another co-accused, namely Amritpal Singh @



Sandy, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 06.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-24211-2025 (Annexure P-2).

3. As per the prosecution, the name of the present petitioner surfaced in the disclosure statement of the main accused Gurmej Singh. Upon his arrest, no narcotic contraband was recovered from his possession; however, an amount of Rs.74,500/- was allegedly recovered from his house as drug money.

In the disclosure statement attributed to the petitioner, it has been alleged that he had supplied 15 kg of heroin worth Rs.15.00 lakhs, out of which he retained Rs.10.00 lakhs for further delivery to unknown persons allegedly sent by smugglers from Pakistan and had given Rs.2.50 lakhs to another co-accused, namely Sukhpal Singh @ Raj.

4. On the other hand, status report and custody certificate dated 18.03.2026 have been filed by learned State counsel in court today, which are taken on record.

Copies thereof have been handed-over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, as the case involves recovery of a commercial quantity of heroin. It is contended that petitioner has been specifically named in the disclosure statement of the main accused and his own disclosure statement further reveals his involvement in the alleged transaction relating to narcotic substances.



However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that no contraband has been recovered from the petitioner and that the co-accused, namely Amritpal Singh @ Sandy, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is noticed that the name of the petitioner has surfaced in the present case on the basis of disclosure statements recorded during the course of investigation. It is not disputed that no contraband has been recovered from the petitioner and only an amount of Rs.74,500/- has been allegedly recovered from his house. A perusal of the status report would further show that no independent or corroborative material has been brought on record to substantiate the allegations against the petitioner, apart from the disclosure statements.

It is also a matter of record that the co-accused, namely Amritpal Singh @ Sandy, who is attributed a similar role, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. Besides, it is also noticeable that petitioner has suffered incarceration inside the jail for a period of 01 year, 06 months and 05 days, up-till 18.03.2026.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, but without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

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**.
- Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 19, 2026
J.Ram

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