



CRM-M-73931-2025

-1-

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

120

CRM-M-73931-2025

Date of Decision: 25.02.2026

RAJDEEP SINGH @GOLU

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. P.S.Sekhon, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Guraziz Singh Dhillon, Advocate and
Mr. Parshan Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 188 dated 04.10.2025 under Sections 21,27-A of NDPS Act registered at Police Station, City Sangrur, District Sangrur.
2. The case of the prosecution is that 143 grams 63 milligrams of heroin and an amount of ₹ 95,000/- alleged to be drug money was recovered from the petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the mandatory provisions of Sections 42, 50 and 52-A of the NDPS Act have not been complied with. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, and the alleged recovery falls under the category of non-commercial quantity. The petitioner is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act and is in custody since 06.10.2025.
4. Notice of motion.



5. Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner is involved in a serious offence and does not deserve the concession of bail. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months and 18 days and is involved in one other case under IPC. It is further submitted that the *challan* has already been presented, investigation is complete and no witness has been examined till date.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months 18 days; no witness has been examined so far; trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude, this Court is of the view that further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Moreover, it is a settled principle of law that “*bail is a rule and jail is an exception*”.

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



CRM-M-73931-2025

-3-

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

25.02.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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