

2026:PHHC:036247



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

125

CRM-M-70150-2025
Date of Decision: 09.03.2026

RAMANDEEP SINGH @ BALI

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Randeep Singh Waraich (Rana), Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.89 dated 07.09.2025 under Section 21 of the NDPS Act, 1985 (Sections 21-C, 21-B, 25 and 29 of the Act added later on) registered at Police Station Shimlapuri, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that from one Shubham Saini, 5 grams of heroin was recovered and on the basis of disclosure statement made by him, the names of Ramandeep Singh @ Bali (petitioner herein) and one Sajjan were surfaced and they were also arrested in the present case.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner was picked up from his house without disclosing any reasons and thereafter, his mother

filed a habeas corpus petition No.CRWP-9794 of 2025. In the said petition, a Warrant Officer was appointed, who raided Police Post Basant Park at about 03:00 AM on 08.09.2025, however, the Warrant Officer was denied entry and pushed outside forcibly and the police premises were locked from inside. A report to the said effect was prepared by the Warrant Officer. Later on, he was informed that 100 grams of heroin was recovered at the instance of the petitioner and as such, he has been arrested in this case. However, this information was not given to the Warrant Officer when he had tried to enter the police post. It is also stated that no intimation of arrest was given to the family members of the petitioner and the present case has been planted upon the petitioner after the visit of Warrant Officer. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 06 months. He thus prays that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the same. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the 06 months.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 06 months coupled with the fact that the Warrant Officer was denied entry in the Police Post and as such, the possibility of false implication of the petitioner cannot be ruled out, this

Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. It is also noticeable that although the petitioner is involved in 03 other cases under NDPS act, however, the conduct of the police officials at the time of visit of Warrant Officer was deplorable. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

MARCH 09, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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