



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117

CRM-M-60136-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.03.2026

Sandeep Singh @ Seepa @ Suniara

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

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

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.321 dated 16.12.2023, registered under Section(s) 21/21(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 04.03.2026 on behalf of respondent(s)-State has been filed by the learned State counsel today in the Court and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. As per the case of the prosecution, one Sunny Deol @ Makhi son of Tarsem Singh was found in conscious possession of 35 grams of *heroin* without any valid permit. During interrogation, the said accused suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that he had purchased 300 grams of *heroin* from the petitioner (herein), out of which he had sold some

contraband and balance had been recovered. During investigation, an additional quantity of 260 grams of *heroin* was recovered on the disclosure of the said co-accused/ Sunny Deol @ Makhi. Hence, commercial quantity of *heroin* was recovered from co-accused/Sunny Deol @ Makhi.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the name of the petitioner cropped up only in the present case on the disclosure of co-accused/Sunny Deol @ Makhi and no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from him. He contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.08.2024 and has undergone an actual custody of more than 01 year 06 months. It is contended that out of the total 13 prosecution witnesses none has been examined so far and the conclusion of trial would take a long time. He contends that there is one more FIR against the petitioner under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 wherein he is already on bail and he has never been declared as a proclaimed person.

5. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present case only on the disclosure of co-accused/Sunny Deol @ Makhi and no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from him. The stage of the trial is also not disputed.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noticed above, including the nature of allegations against the petitioner, the period of actual custody undergone by him, absence of any recovery and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the

instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

8. It is made clear 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 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

05.03.2026

Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No