



FIR in question was registered. During investigation, the aforesaid accused Tejbir Singh made a disclosure statement and name of the petitioner cropped up in the present case vide DDR No.40 dated 01.03.2025.

Learned counsel for petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case. He was not named in the FIR and was arrested only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which is not admissible in law. Apart from the aforesaid disclosure statement, no material has been placed on record to connect the petitioner with the alleged recovery in the present case. Nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner. There is no direct or indirect evidence which may link the petitioner with the alleged commission of offence. He further urged that trial of the case is likely to take time. Therefore, the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

Learned State counsel opposed the present bail petition while contending that the co-accused Tejbir Singh has admitted in his disclosure statement that they used to do smuggling of heroin with the petitioner and had specifically named the petitioner for having been indulged in smuggling of contraband. So, keeping in view serious allegations against the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the case file.

The petitioner has not been named in the FIR. His name has cropped up in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Tejbir Singh. As per disclosure statement of this co-accused, he had been indulging in smuggling of contraband along with the petitioner. The



CRM-M-29992-2025

3

recovery of alleged contraband had been effected from the co-accused Tejbir Singh and Vishal Singh. There is no such material on record to show that the petitioner was connected with the aforesaid recovery in any manner.

As per the Custody Certificate dated 07.09.2025, which has been placed on record today in Court, the petitioner has already undergone custody of 06 months and 04 days. The trial of the case is going on and conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. No useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted on regular bail, on furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of concerned learned Trial Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

September 08, 2025

monika

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>