



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

221

**CRM-M No.19393 of 2026
Date of decision : 17.4.2026
Date of uploading : 17.4.2026**

Karanjot Singh alias Kichi alias GhichuPetitioner
Versus
State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Dolli Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.71 dated 23.12.2025 under Sections 21, 27-A, 29, 61, 85 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Mattewal, District Amritsar.
2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner is an accused of being involved in FIR pertaining to NDPS Act involving 14 grams of heroin and ₹1000/- as drug money allegedly recovered from the petitioner on 23.12.2025 at Tahli Sahib near village Mattewal.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 23.12.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that



the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version available at this juncture is taken to be correct, the petitioner is stated to be in conscious possession of 14 grams of heroin and ₹1000/- as drug money. Learned counsel has further submitted that the sole basis of terming the recovery of ₹1000/- as drug money is the confessional statement of the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that recovery of ₹1000/- is shown as drug money only to invoke the rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is accused of offence pertaining to commercial quantity under the NDPS Act, and thus, his bail petition is barred in view of the Section 37 of the Act. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 16.4.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is in custody since 23.12.2025. The contraband alleged to have been recovered from the petitioner is 14 grams of heroin, which is non-commercial in nature. The



police has sought to invoke the rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act by stating that the recovery of ₹1000/- from the petitioner is drug money. However, at this juncture, the only basis of terming the said recovery as drug money is the confessional statement of the petitioner, veracity of which will be tested during the course of trial. Culmination of investigation as also the trial emanating therefrom, in case occasion so arises, will take long time. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 16.4.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 3 months and 23 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in one more case/FIR. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd.*



Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in ***CRM-M No.38822-2022*** titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
- (viii) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned trial Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise, the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his



bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

17.4.2026
Ashwani

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