



CRM-M-17953-2025 1

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

214

**CRM-M-17953-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 27.08.2025**

Angrej Singh @ Kali

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH****Present:** Mr. K.S.Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J.(Oral)**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

<b>Name of Petitioner(s)</b>	<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Section(s)</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	<b>District</b>
<b>Angrej Singh @ Kali</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>02.09.2024</b>	<b>22(c)/61/85 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Later on Section 29 of NDPS Act added vide DDR No.33 dated 04.09.2024)</b>	<b>Sadar Abohar</b>	<b>Fazilka</b>

2. In the instant case, there is recovery of 5500 intoxicant tablets of Tramadol Hydrochloride from main accused-Baljeet Singh. Subsequent to the arrest of accused-Baljeet Singh, one disclosure statement was recorded,



**CRM-M-17953-2025 2**

in which present petitioner was nominated as supplier of the said tablets to Baljeet Singh and thereupon, he was also implicated as accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that apart the disclosure statement, neither there is any other evidence, to fortify the contents of it nor the evidence is highlighted, showing money transaction or even telephonic conversation between them. In all likelihood, prosecution would not be able to succeed only on the basis of disclosure statement. Petitioner is inside jail for a period of about 11 months and 19 days and is not involved in any other similar activity punishable under NDPS Act.

Further contends that petitioner is a young person aged about 28 years and his family members are completely dependent upon him as he is the only source to earn livelihood for them. Lastly contends that out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date.

Learned counsel, thus, prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate as well as status report dated 26.08.2025 in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 11 months and 19 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against him.

5. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature; hence, he does not deserve the concession of bail pending trial.



CRM-M-17953-2025 3

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds that the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner are more impressive than respondent. Even, learned State counsel could not highlight any such evidence, showing direct involvement of the petitioner in the crime. For proving the charges, there has to be positive or affirmative evidence with the prosecution, which of course if available, can be produced during the course of trial.

Moreover, it is not the allegation of State that in case, petitioner is released on bail, he shall influence the witnesses or hamper the course of trial, in any manner; thus, further incarceration of the petitioner is not likely to serve any meaningful purpose.

7. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

8. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly



**CRM-M-17953-2025 4**

found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

**27.08.2025**

Rajeev (rvs)

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**