



CRM-M-14146-2025

1

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

222-2

**CRM-M-14146-2025
Decided on :14.05.2025**

Manpreet Singh @ Manu . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rama Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner-Manpreet Singh @ Manu, has filed instant petition seeking regular bail in case FIR No.175 dated 12.11.2024, under Sections 21(c)/61/85 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act was added later on vide G.D. No.15 dated 16.11.2024), registered at Police Station Special Task Force, District STF Wing, during the pendency of trial.

2. On 30.04.2025, following order was passed:

“Present:Mr. Rama Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

1.Present second 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:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Manpreet	175	12.11.2024	21(c)/61/85 of	Special	STF



CRM-M-14146-2025

2

Singh alias Manu			NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act, added later on vide GD No.15, dated 16.11.2024)	Task Force	Wing
------------------------	--	--	---	---------------	------

2. Counsel for the petitioner contends that there is recovery of 284 grams of 'Heroin' from the possession of Veena and Karan (mother and son), and thereupon, FIR was registered on 12.11.2024. It is, thereafter, i.e. 16.11.2024, one disclosure statement is shown to have been projected by the prosecution, wherein, name of the petitioner – Manpreet Singh alias Manu, and co-accused Rajwinder Singh @ Rajan, have been mentioned as supplier of the 'Heroin' to the already arrested accused.

3. Further submits that the anticipatory bail petition i.e. CRM-M-10113-2025 (P-4) qua Rajwinder Singh @ Rajan (co-accused), is fixed for 14.05.2025, wherein, said co-accused Rajwinder Singh @ Rajan, is on interim bail.

4. List on 14.05.2025.

To be heard along with CRM-M-10113-2025.

April 30, 2025

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE”

3. As noticed on the previous date of hearing, i.e., 30.04.2025, a recovery of 284 grams of heroin was effected from the possession of Veena and Karan (mother and son), based on their disclosure statements, the names of the petitioner, Manpreet Singh @ Manu, and co-accused Rajwinder Singh @ Rajan surfaced as the alleged suppliers of the contraband.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that vide order of even date passed in CRM-M-10113-2025, co-accused Rajwinder Singh @ Rajan has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since



CRM-M-14146-2025

3

25.12.2024. The investigation has since been completed and the challan stands presented before the trial Court. However, the process of recording of evidence is yet to commence. Although charges have been framed, the proceedings are presently fixed for 21.05.2025. Learned counsel thus submits that conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time.

5. Learned State Counsel confirms the factum of custody suffered by the petitioner and the current status of proceedings before the trial Court. He also does not dispute the fact that anticipatory bail granted to the co-accused Rajwinder Singh @ Rajan, who is stated to be similarly situated has been confirmed.

6. Taking into consideration the totality of circumstances, particularly the fact that the petitioner has been in custody for over five months, and that the co-accused, namely Rajwinder Singh @ Rajan, who is similarly situated has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, this Court is of the considered view that the continued custodial detention of the petitioner is not warranted. Accordingly, 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.

7. However, it is made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be involved in similar activities, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek revocation of bail in the present case.



CRM-M-14146-2025

4

8. 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.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

14.05.2025

Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No