



CRM-M-69706-2025

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.121

CRM-M-69706-2025
Date of Decision: 23.02.2026

SATBIR SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case registered vide FIR No. 198, dated 14.07.2024, under Sections 15, 61, 29A and 85 of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Sadar Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.

2. Briefly stated, as per the case of the investigating agency, on 14.07.2024, ASI Satvinder Singh along with other police officials was present on patrolling duty near Power House, Village Adohya, when he received secret information that the petitioner Satbir Singh along with his co-accused Harjinder Singh was engaged in selling poppy husk, which they used to procure from Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan and transport in vehicles. Acting upon the said information, a raiding party reached the house of the petitioner and co-accused, where co-accused Harjinder Singh was apprehended in possession of 223 kg of poppy husk kept in the vehicles.



3. On this basis, a ruqa/tehrir was sent to the police station and the present FIR was registered. During interrogation, co-accused Harjinder Singh made a disclosure statement implicating the present petitioner, who was subsequently arrested and has been in judicial custody since 11.06.2025. Hence, the present petition for grant of regular bail has been filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present FIR was registered on the basis of secret information. Although the petitioner is named therein, he was not found present at the spot at the time of the raid. It is submitted that it was co-accused Harjinder Singh, father of the petitioner, who was apprehended at the spot and from whose conscious possession the alleged contraband was recovered. The petitioner has merely been implicated on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Harjinder Singh. It is further argued that nothing whatsoever has been recovered from the possession of the present petitioner and no independent evidence connects him with the alleged recovery. Therefore, the petitioner claims that he deserves the concession of regular bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that the petitioner is the son of the main accused Harjinder Singh and is closely associated with him. It is argued that since commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the conscious possession of Harjinder Singh and the said accused has disclosed the name of the petitioner in his disclosure statement, the petitioner is equally liable for the said recovery. On this premise, it is contended that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.



CRM-M-69706-2025

3

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. Admittedly, nothing has been recovered from the possession of the present petitioner and the recovery of commercial quantity has been effected from co-accused Harjinder Singh, who is stated to be the father of the petitioner. The petitioner was not apprehended at the spot and his implication is primarily based upon the disclosure statement of co-accused. It is also not disputed that co-accused, namely Vijay Kumar, Karanvir Singh, Narender Singh @ Rinku and Lovepreet Singh @ Labbu, have already been granted the concession of bail. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about eight months and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner is likely to abscond or tamper with prosecution evidence if released on bail.

7. In view of the above facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

23.02.2026

Anu

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