



CRM-M-68739-2025

1

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

111

CRM-M-68739-2025
Decided on: 19.05.2026

Rinku Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Tushar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS seeking regular bail in case FIR No.183 dated 25.12.2024, under Section 21 of NDPS Act (Sections 22, 29/61/85 of NDPS Act and now charges framed under Sections 22(c), 29, 27-B of NDPS Act), registered at Police Station Barnala, District Barnala Punjab.

2. It is noticed that recovery of 15 bottles/vials of Wincerex Cough Syrup, 100 ml each, containing Codeine Phosphate, which falls within the commercial quantity, has been effected from the petitioner.

3. From the custody certificate produced by learned State counsel in Court today, it transpires that petitioner is already a convict in FIR No.165 dated 27.11.2017, registered under Sections 21 and 29 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Sadar Barnala, wherein he was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 15 years along with a fine of Rs.1,50,000/-, and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months.



CRM-M-68739-2025

2

It is further noticed that in another case, namely FIR No.04 dated 06.01.2020, registered under Sections 21, 22, 29, 61 and 85 of the NDPS Act at Police Station City Barnala, the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 10 years along with a fine of Rs.1,00,000/-, and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year. Petitioner was granted bail in the said case vide order dated 17.02.2024 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Barnala.

It is also not disputed that the petitioner has undergone only about 26 days of custody in the present case, as he is presently serving sentence in the aforesaid cases in which he already stands convicted. Present FIR was registered subsequently in point of time.

4. Considering the nature of allegations, recovery being of commercial quantity, antecedents of the petitioner, and the fact that petitioner is already convicted in two other cases under the NDPS Act, this Court does not find any substantial ground to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. Consequently, present petition is **dismissed**.

5. However, petitioner would be at liberty to file a fresh petition for grant of bail after undergoing a substantial period of custody in the present case and after securing appropriate orders in the earlier case(s) in which he already stands convicted.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 19, 2026

rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO