

2026:PHHC:034383



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

130

CRM-M-70953-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 06.03.2026

Varinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Ms. Rakhi Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 20 dated 28.03.2024, registered under Sections 21(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) and Sections 10, 11 and 12 of the Air Craft Act, 1934 at Police Station Sarai Amanat Khan, District Tarn Taran.

2. The aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of a letter received from the office of Commander 'E' Coy, 71 Bn BSF, District Tarn Taran, regarding the recovery of a packet containing 500 grams of heroin, one black-coloured motorcycle make Hero Splendor, and two smartphones from two suspected persons, who managed to flee away from the fields on 27.03.2024.

2026:PHHC:034383



During the course of investigation, on 23.06.2024, accused Dilpreet Singh @ Dil, who was booked in another case bearing FIR No. 44 dated 21.06.2024, under Section 21-C of the NDPS Act at the same police station, suffered disclosure statement to the effect that on 27.03.2024, he along with co-accused Jodhbir Singh had gone to the place of recovery on a motorcycle to receive the consignment of heroin from Pakistani smugglers through drone, where the present petitioner was already waiting for them and he had sent their location to the Pakistani smugglers through mobile phone of the present petitioner. On the basis of the same, the petitioner and Jodhbir Singh were nominated in this case as accused. The petitioner was arrested on 04.06.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the subject crime. Co-accused was also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the above named co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. No recovery has been effected from him. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner was involved in the subject crime in any manner with the co-accused. Even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. His involvement in other cases cannot be made a ground for denying him the benefit of bail in the given circumstances. The petitioner has been in custody since 04.06.2025. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner

2026:PHHC:034383



deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Status report along with the custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner as well as his criminal antecedents, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail as Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted in this case. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The well settled proposition of law is that the Court while considering an application for grant of bail has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a prima facie case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment in the event of conviction; the danger of accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail and reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened. The period of incarceration is also relevant fact that is to be considered. It is also unequivocally established that, to be granted bail, the accused charged with offence under the provisions of NDPS Act must fulfill the conditions stipulated in Section 37 of the Act. A contention has been raised that the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted in the present case as there is recovery of commercial quantity of contraband.

7. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the above named co-accused with the allegations that the petitioner was also involved with them in commission of subject crime and was

2026:PHHC:034383



present at the place, from where the aforesaid recoveries were effected. It is also alleged by the co-accused that they had sent their location to Pakistani smuggler through the mobile phone of the present petitioner. However, it is an admitted position that no contraband was recovered from the petitioner subsequent to his arrest. In *Tofan Singh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1*, it was observed by Hon'ble Apex Court that the disclosure statements made under Section 67 of NDPS Act, are inadmissible in evidence unless corroborated by independent material. While the veracity of the disclosure statement against the petitioner will be tested during the course of trial, however, at this stage, it cannot be ignored that no recovery was ever effected from the petitioner. The petitioner was arrested on 04.06.2025. There is nothing on record, at this stage, to connect the petitioner either with the subject crime or to show that he was connected with the co-accused in any manner at the relevant time. Investigation has been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial would take considerable time as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. Pendency of other cases against the petitioner cannot be considered to be a ground for denying him benefit of bail in given circumstances. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other

2026:PHHC:034383



subsequent case.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

06.03.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No