



CRM-M-70904-2025

1

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

337

CRM-M-70904-2025

Decided on :10.02.2026

Gurpreet Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Manvinder Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jain, Asst. A.G., Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 0120 dated 06.08.2024 under Section 15(c), 27, 29 of NDPS, Section 25 of Arms Act (added later on), registered at Police Station Special Task Force, District STF Wing.

2. As per case of the prosecution, one Gurpal Singh had leased 19/20 acres of land to one Parshan Singh, s/o Surjit Singh. From a room constructed on the said land, 183.500 kgs of poppy husk, along with one country-made pistol, was recovered.

When Parshan Singh, the lessee of the land, was arrested, he made a disclosure statement stating that the land had actually been taken on lease by him along with Gurpreet Singh (petitioner herein) and Jagsir Singh. He further stated that all three of them were using the land for bringing poppy husk from Rajasthan and storing it in the fields.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that merely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Parshan Singh, petitioner

**CRM-M-70904-2025****2**

has been implicated in the present case. Counsel further submits that other co-accused, namely Jagsir Singh and Parshan Singh, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 05.12.2025 (P-6) and 08.12.2025 (P-7), passed in CRM-M-52283-2025 and CRM-M-40398-2025, respectively.

4. Counsel also submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. This argument is substantiated by the fact that although the recovery was effected on 06.08.2024, petitioner was implicated as an accused only after more than three and a half months, vide DDR No. 20 dated 20.11.2024, upon recording the disclosure statement. Petitioner is in custody since 25.07.2025, whereas the co-accused have already been released on bail. In view of these circumstances, counsel prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel is not in a position to controvert any of the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, including the fact that the other two co-accused, namely Jagsir Singh and Parshan Singh, have already been granted bail by this Court, and with whom the petitioner is similarly situated.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto, including the status report.

7. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been falsely implicated, the co-accused with whom he is similarly situated have already been granted bail, and that petitioner is in custody since

**CRM-M-70904-2025****3**

25.07.2025, this Court finds merit in the petitioner's prayer. Accordingly, 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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, 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.

9. It is specifically observed and ordered that in case the petitioner is again found involved in any other NDPS case, the concerned Public Prosecutor shall move an application for cancellation of bail in the present case.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

10.02.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No