



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

1) CRM-M-67363-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 10.04.2026

Gurpreet Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

2) CRM-M-1652-2026 (O&M)

Neelu . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

3) CRM-M-66793-2025 (O&M)

Jaswant Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Laghuinder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-1652-2026).

Mr. Gaurav Arora, Advocate and
Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-1652-2026).

Mr. Amardeep Singh Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-66793-2025).

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-67363-2025 (O&M), CRM-M-1652-2026 (O&M) and CRM-M-66793-2025(O&M), as all the petitions

are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-1652-2026 (O&M).

2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have 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
Gurpreet Singh [petitioner in CRM-M-67363-2025 (O&M)]	157	27.04.2025	21-C, 27-A and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985	Sadar Sirsa	Sirsa
Neelu [petitioner in CRM-M-1652-2026 (O&M)]	157	27.04.2025	21(c), 29 & 27-A (added later on) of NDPS Act, 1985	Sadar Sirsa	Sirsa
Jaswant Singh [petitioner in CRM-M-66793-2025 (O&M)]	157	27.04.2025	21(c), 29 of NDPS Act, 1985, and challan presented u/s 21(c), 29, 27A of NDPS Act, 1985	Sadar Sirsa	Sirsa

3. FIR in the present case was registered on receipt of a secret information, wherein, it was mentioned that one boy (accused in the present case) namely, Gurpreet Singh, is indulged in the business of heroin (chitta) and he used to bring heavy quantity of chitta from Punjab and then supply the same in the nearby areas of Sirsa. If today, raid is conducted, said Gurpreet Singh can be apprehended along with contraband.

On being intercepted by the police, one person was noticed de-boarding the bus and holding a bag of black colour and was coming from wrong side of the road. On seeing the police party, he started moving quickly and on being apprehended, he was held with bag, and thereafter, on checking of the same, 450 grams and 09 milligrams of heroin was recovered from it.

4. During the course of investigation, accused – Gurpreet Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-67363-2025) was interrogated, and thereupon, on

28.04.2025, he got recorded his disclosure statement, and demarcated the place, where, unknown motorcycle rider had given the recovered heroin (chitta) to him and his friend, namely, Paramjeet Kaur.

On 30.04.2025, another disclosure statement of accused/petitioner – Gurpreet Singh was recorded, where, he named co-accused – Neelam @ Neelu (herein ‘Neelu’ petitioner in CRM-M-1652-2026) and Paramjeet Kaur.

When co-accused/petitioner Neelu was arrested, another name disclosed by her of Jaswant Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-66793-2025).

This is how the three petitioners herein were made accused in the present case and all of them have filed present petitions for seeking concession of regular bail.

5. Without arguing much, Mr. Laghuinder Singh Sekhon, learned counsel for the petitioner – Gurpreet Singh (in CRM-M-67363-2025), seeks permission to withdraw the petition *qua* petitioner – Gurpreet Singh, at this stage.

6. **CRM-M-67363-2025, dismissed as withdrawn, at this stage.**

7. Learned counsel for remaining petitioners, i.e., Neelu & Jaswant Singh, argue that except of the involvement of the petitioners through disclosure statements, there is no other substantive material ever collected by the Investigating Agency during investigation.

Referring to paragraph No.5 of the status report dated 09.04.2026 (filed in Court today by learned State counsel), it is also pointed out that during investigation, nothing material covered as offence under the NDPS Act was recovered from either the accused/petitioners herein, namely, Neelu and Jaswant Singh. Moreover, recovered contraband of heroin (chitta)

was found in the possession of co-accused – Gurpreet Singh, which he was having in the bag handled by him independently, therefore, only, because of naming of petitioners in his disclosure statements, that too, much after his arrest, would not be sufficient to assume at this stage that the petitioners are guilty in the case.

8. Learned counsel representing petitioner – Neelu (in CRM-M-1652-2026) also strengthens his submissions by arguing that earlier to the registration of present case, petitioner – Neelu, was involved in three other cases under the NDPS Act. Therefore, already being known to the members of the police team and just with an idea or plan to implicate her in one more case, has been named through a belatedly recorded disclosure statement, i.e., 30.04.2025 (after a period of about three days of actual recovery from co-accused Gurpreet Singh). Broadly, it is being argued that the allegations are yet to be proved beyond doubt by the prosecution and till then, their incarceration inside jail would not serve any meaningful purpose. Thus, prays has been made for extending the concession of regular bail to the petitioners – Neelu and Jaswant Singh.

9. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the separate custody certificates dated 08.04.2206 along with a comprehensive status report dated 09.04.2026 in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate places.

Copies thereof have been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner(s).

10. Learned State counsel while vehemently opposes the prayer for bail, again highlights the involvement of the petitioner – Neelam in three other cases, i.e.;

- (I) *FIR No.135, dated 27.05.2020, under sections 21/61/85 NDPS Act, PS City Kharar, Mohali, which is pending in the Ld. trial Court for 26.05.2026 for prosecution evidence.*
- (II) *FIR No.105/2024, under sections 21b/27/61/85 NDPS Act, PS City Sirsa, which is pending in the Ld. trial Court for 27.04.2026 for consideration on charge.*
- (III) *FIR No.103, dated 26.03.2025, under sections 21C/29/61/85 NDPS Act, PS Sadar Sirsa, which is pending in the Ld. trial Court for 21.05.2026 for appearance.*

Further submits that petitioner – Neelu being the habitual offender and in such like cases, petitioners like persons are not entitled for any such discretionary relief.

11. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance, and find that recovery of heroin (chitta) was effected from accused – Gurpreet Singh on 27.04.2025, whereas, second disclosure statement *qua* involvement of the petitioner – Neelu (in CRM-M-1652-2026) was recorded belatedly on 30.04.2025 by accused – Gurpreet Singh. However, no narcotic substance was recovered from her possession.

Not only this, petitioner – Jaswant Singh (in CRM-M-66793-2025) is also involved in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused/petitioner herein – Neelu, on 02.06.2025.

It is, thus, evident that both the petitioners, namely, Neelu and Jaswant Singh, have been implicated in the present case primarily on the basis of disclosure statements of co-accused and not on the basis of any recovery effected from them. At this stage, the evidentiary value of such disclosure statements is a matter to be examined during the course of trial.

So far as the involvement of petitioner – Neelu in other cases is

concerned, though the same has been pointed out by learned State counsel, however, it is not disputed that she is on bail in those cases. Mere pendency of other cases, cannot be made the sole ground to deny the concession of bail in the present case, particularly when no recovery has been effected from her in this case.

12. Without commenting on the merits of the case, and considering the nature of allegations, manner of implication of the petitioners, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered view that at this stage, there are reasonable grounds to believe that the petitioners are not guilty of the offence alleged against them and are not likely to indulge in similar offences while on bail.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions is **allowed**.
Petitioners – **Neelu** (in **CRM-M-1652-2026**) and **Jaswant Singh** (in **CRM-M-66793-2025**) are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

13. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

14. 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.

15. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioners are directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

16. **Petitions stand disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

April 10, 2026
J.Ram

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