



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

CRM-M-65871-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 23.02.2026

Vishaldeep Singh @ Kittu

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

131

CRM-M-69118-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 23.02.2026

Shamsher Singh @ Mithi

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(in CRM-M-65871-2025).

Mr. Gaurav, Advocate for
Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(in CRM-M-69118-2025).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Both these petitions are being decided by this common order, as they pertain to same FIR i.e. FIR bearing No.156 dated 27.09.2025 registered under Sections 21, 27A (Section 29 added later on) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Chattiwind, District Amritsar. A brief reference of the facts is however being made from *CRM-M-65871-2025* titled as '*Vishaldeep Singh @ Kittu*

Vs. State of Punjab'.

2. As per case set up by the prosecution, on 27.09.2025, while Police was on Patrolling duty, they noticed two young persons coming from front. On seeing the Police party, they got scared and tried to turn back and threw a plastic polythene bag after taking it out from the right pocket(s) of their pants. On being apprehended, they disclosed their names as Shamsher Singh @ Mithi (petitioner in CRM-M-69118-2025) and Vishaldeep Singh @ Kittu (petitioner in CRM-M-65871-2025). On checking of the polythene bags, *Heroine* was recovered. Petitioner-Shamsher Singh @ Mithi was alleged to have been carrying 8 grams of *heroin*, while petitioner-Vishaldeep Singh @ Kittu was alleged to have been carrying 10 grams of *heroin*.

3. Counsel for the petitioners contend that the petitioners in both the petitions have been in custody since 27.09.2025 and have undergone an actual custody of nearly 05 months. They contend that the recovered contraband falls in non-commercial quantity. They contend that the challan has not been filed, hence, the conclusion of trial shall take a long time.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioners, the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioners as well as the fact that the investigation is still pending 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.

6. Accordingly, the instant petitions are **allowed** and the

128

CRM-M-65871-2025 (O&M)

131

CRM-M-69118-2025 (O&M)

petitioners are ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. 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.

23.02.2026

Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE