

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:035923



CRM-M-70758-2025 (O&M)

Bobby @ Popy

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	06.03.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	10.03.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	10.03.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Ms. Amarjot Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.28, dated 22.04.2024, registered under Sections 302, 148 and 149 of IPC (offence

under Sections 201, 202 and 34 of IPC and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (For short “NDPS Act”) added and offence under Sections 148 and 149 of IPC were deleted lateron), at Police Station Qadian, District Batala.

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR had been registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Jeeta on 22.04.2024, alleging therein that on 21.04.2024, he was present in his house along with his wife Paramjeet Kaur when the accused Vishal @ Khuda, the Sumit Kumar @ Sumit @ Ghung, Manjit Singh @ Jajji, Amritpal Singh @ Ammy and Pavitar came outside and called his son Sahil and took him along with them. His son did not return home. In the night, he had kept making search for his son and in the morning, he came to know about the dead body of some youth lying near Batala Road, Qadian. He rushed towards the spot and identified the dead body to be that of his son. Blood was oozing out from the nose and there were injury marks on the dead body. He alleged that the above named accused had administered some poisonous substance to his son and had caused injuries to him thereby killing him and thereafter had thrown his dead body. The cause of grudge as given by him was that there was some money dispute between the victim and the assailants. Investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of the dead body was conducted. On 24.04.2024, the complainant recorded a supplementary statement that the co-accused Manjit Singh @ Jajji, Amritpal Singh @ Ammy and Pavitar had delivered contraband heroin to the co-accused Vishal and Sumit and they had given the same to the victim for consumption. He also recorded that the

victim had even gone to the house of the present petitioner, who had injected heroin to him (the victim), due to which he had died. Parents of the petitioner had then wrapped the dead body of the victim in some clothing and had thrown the same in the drain near Dogra Dharamkanda Road Batala. The petitioner and his parents were nominated as additional accused. The petitioner was arrested on 24.04.2024. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and got recovered a cycle cart which was used by him and his parents for transporting the dead body of the victim from their house to the drain. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR and was subsequently implicated by the complainant by making due deliberations and concoctions. The complainant and his wife have already been examined and have turned hostile as they did not implicate co-accused Manjit Singh @ Jajji, Amritpal Singh @ Ammy and Sumit in commission of the subject offence. They were not the eye witnesses of the factum of petitioner's injecting any contraband to their son. Co-accused Sumit, Manjit, Rani and Raju have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. His antecedents are clean. There are no chances of his absconding. No useful purpose would be served by keeping in custody anymore. It, has been, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel while relying upon the status report has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who he had injected heroin to the victim, due to which he had died

and then he along with his parents had wrapped the dead body of the victim in a cloth and had thrown it. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, stressed that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have injected a syringe containing heroin to the victim resulting into his death. He was not named in the FIR and was nominated on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant. There is no eye witness to the factum of his administering contraband to the victim and the case rests upon the hear-say evidence of the complainant and his wife. Co-accused Raju and Rani, who are parents of the petitioner have been extended benefit of bail. The petitioner is in custody for a period of about 01 year and 10 months. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. Continued detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. It is only on thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial that any definite conclusion as to the involvement of the petitioner in commission of subject offence can be drawn.

7. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for his release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be

construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

10.03.2026

harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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