



CRM-M-25410-2025

1

222

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

CRM-M-25410-2025

DECIDED ON: 19.08.2025

HIMANSHU BHARTI @ LUCKY SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Sajan, Advocate, for
Mr. S.K. Passi, 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:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Himanshu Bharti @ Lucky Singh	02	07.01.2025	22 of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on)	Sadar Sangrur	Sangrur

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the case of prosecution, allegations are that, on 07.01.2025, one accused, namely Navjosh Singh @ Joshi, was arrested while in possession of 1,500 tablets of alprazolam. Based on his disclosure statement, another accused, Gurpreet Singh, was identified and subsequently arrested on



09.01.2025. On 10.01.2025, Gurpreet Singh named a third accused, Nisha Kaur, who was arrested on 06.03.2025. Nisha Kaur, in turn, gave a disclosure statement naming the petitioner, as being involved in the drug deal, leading to the petitioner's inclusion as an accused in the present case.

3. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner is inside jail, undergoing incarceration since 08.03.2025. Despite the investigation being completed, process of recording the statements of the witnesses is yet to commence. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed status report dated 18.08.2025, in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

5. Learned State counsel does not dispute the factual assertions made by counsel for the petitioner before this Court today and clarifies that, apart from the disclosure statement implicating the petitioner, there is no record of any similar activity registered against him in the past. However, despite these facts, learned State counsel vehemently opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. On being asked by the Court, learned State counsel submits that no contraband or drugs were recovered from the possession of the subsequently arrested accused, namely Gurpreet Singh, Nisha Kaur, and Himanshu Bharti. However, all of them are found to be connected with the main accused, Navjosh Singh @ Joshi.



7. This Court has heard the submissions made by counsel for both the parties and carefully examined the record before it.

Taking into account all the facts and circumstances, including the fact that no contraband was recovered from the petitioner's possession and that he has no prior involvement in similar activities, this Court finds no substantial reason to detain him any longer inside jail. Therefore, in view of the totality of circumstances and nature of the allegations against the petitioner, this Court deems it appropriate to grant 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. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.



12. Petition stands disposed of.

19.08.2025

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*