



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

124

CRM-M-65767-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.03.2026

Ranbir Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.57 dated 14.03.2025, registered under Section(s) 21(C), 25, 27-A and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, 561 grams of *heroin* was recovered from co-accused/Gursahib Singh and Jaswant Singh. He contends that the said two co-accused nominated the petitioner and Sukhjit Singh as accused in their disclosure. He contends that the petitioner and Sukhjit Singh were taken in custody on 15.03.2025 and that on their joint disclosure alleged recovery of Rs.17.60 lakhs alongwith 4000 American Dollars and one laptop was effected from a shop. He contends that on the basis of aforesaid recovery, the petitioner had been nominated as an accused in the

present case.

3. The following arguments are raised:-

- (i) Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that it is a case of joint disclosure by the petitioner as well as co-accused/Sukhjit Singh, hence, the recovery in question cannot be attributed to the petitioner;
- (ii) It is contended that the petitioner is a labourer and has been nominated as an accused only on account of aforesaid recovery from a shop, which does not belong to him and he has no link with the same as well; and
- (iii) It is contended that the petitioner is stated to be a handler of the aforesaid amount on behalf of the co-accused/Gursahib Singh, Jaswant Singh alongwith Sukhjit Singh, however, there is no reason as to why the drug proceeds was handed over to him. Further, no procurement of goods has been established from him.

4. It is further argued by the counsel for the petitioner that the trial is yet to commence and there are total of 12 prosecution witnesses, which are to be examined, hence, the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude.

5. Learned counsel for respondent-State submits that the involvement of the petitioner is established from the disclosure of the co-accused and the subsequent recovery of the cash at the disclosure of the petitioner and co-accused/Sukhjit Singh from a bag lying in a shop. He is however not in a position to refer to the evidence collected by the

investigating agency with respect to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the petitioner.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the period of actual custody undergone by him as well as the stage of the trial 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/Illaqa 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**

**16.03.2026**

*Mangal Singh*

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