



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at  
Chandigarh**

216

CRM-M-62082-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 18.02.2026

|                     |        |                |
|---------------------|--------|----------------|
| Ranjit Singh @ Raja |        | ... Petitioner |
|                     | Versus |                |
| State of Punjab     |        | ... Respondent |

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

Present:- Mr. Davinder Singh Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J.** (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.86 dated 06.09.2025 under Sections 21/29/61/85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Phase 8, District SAS Nagar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused wherein he has been alleged to be the supplier of the recovered contraband; apart from the said disclosure statement, there is no independent evidence connecting the petitioner to the commission of the alleged offence; the petitioner has been in custody since 11.09.2025, i.e., for the last 05 months and 06 days; petitioner has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case except the present one. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner be released on regular bail.
3. Custody certificate of the petitioner filed by learned State counsel in Court, is taken on record. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner is involved in drug trafficking and had supplied the contraband



CRM-M-62082-2025 (O&M) ( 2 )

which was recovered from the co-accused. However, he fairly admitted that, as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is not involved in any other case. He further submitted that the trial is presently at the stage of prosecution evidence; out of total 8 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, and 2 witnesses have been given up.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that the petitioner was nominated on the basis of disclosure statement, which is inadmissible in evidence; that no recovery has been effected from his possession; that he has clean antecedents and has been in custody for the last about 5 months and 6 days; the trial is presently at the stage of prosecution evidence, with none out of 8 prosecution witnesses examined so far and 2 witnesses already given up, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. 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.

18.02.2026

Geeta

( SUBHAS MEHLA )  
JUDGE

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