



CRM-M-71888-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

118

CRM-M-71888-2025
Decided on : 27.04.2026

Husandeep Singh @ Husan

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Ankush Rampal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Husandeep Singh @ Husan, aged 19 years	65	22.03.2025	22(c) of NDPS Act, 1985	Lambi	Sri Muktsar Sahib

2. Reading the contents of the FIR, counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation of jointly keeping a black polythene bag by both the accused, i.e. petitioner and his co-accused Jashanpreet Singh @ Jeenu @ Jashandeep Singh, appears highly improbable. Upon searching the bag, it was found to contain only 30 Etizolam tablets, with the total active salt weighing 5.970 grams.

It is further contended that both the accused persons were allegedly in



CRM-M-71888-2025

a Honda City car, bearing registration No.DL-10-CH-1204. Had there been any truth in the allegations, it would have been far easier and more logical for the accused persons to dispose of the contraband while remaining in the vehicle they were already occupying, rather than throwing it away jointly.

3. Further submits that petitioner is a young boy, aged 19 years, with no previous involvement in any criminal activity. Petitioner is in custody for a period of more than 01 year and 01 month. Out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined, till date. He further submits that co-accused Jashanpreet Singh @ Jeenu @ Jashandeep Singh has already been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 19.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-66256-2025. Therefore, conclusion of the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute any of the factual assertions made by counsel for the petitioner before this Court. However, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that the quantity of the active substance in the Etizolam recovered from the polythene bag is of commercial quantity, being more than double the non-commercial threshold of 2.5 grams. Thus, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

6. Taking into account the totality of circumstances, facts and allegations levelled against the petitioner, status report filed by learned State counsel, period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, and stage of the trial, wherein only one out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, has been examined, till date; and considering that the allegations are yet to be confirmed by the trial court on the



CRM-M-71888-2025

basis of complete set of evidence, and more importantly, that petitioner is a first time offender and a young boy of 19 years of age, it is necessary to afford the petitioner an opportunity for rehabilitation and reintegration into society. Moreover, co-accused Jashanpreet Singh @ Jeenu @ Jashandeep Singh has already been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 19.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-66256-2025. In the light of above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his 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.

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

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

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

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 27, 2026

reena

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