



2026:PHHC:056110

CRM-M-10803-2026 (O&M)

1

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

2026:PHHC:056110



CRM-M-10803-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.04.2026

RANJIT SINGH ALIAS BAGGO

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking fourth regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita in FIR No.124 dated 01.05.2020 under Sections 21, 61, 85 of NDPS Act and Section 188 IPC registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, Punjab.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 255 gms of heroin has been recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner was carrying the said contraband without any licence or permit.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner is in custody for the last 03 years, 03 months and 11 days. He, thus prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record.



As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 years, 03 months and 11 days. He further submits that petitioner is involved in 05 other cases and out of total cited 11 prosecution witnesses, only 05 witnesses have been examined so far.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that out of total cited 11 prosecution witnesses, only 05 witnesses have been examined so far; all the prosecution witnesses who are official witnesses are not appearing despite non-bailable warrants being issued against them to depose against the petitioner and causing delay in the trial; the petitioner is in custody for more than 03 years, 03 months and 11 days; the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court has no option but to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Reference can be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Pardeep Kumar @ Banu versus State of Punjab*, bearing Criminal Appeal No.1341/2026 (arising out of SLP(Cri.) No.18775/2025), decided on 13.03.2026, wherein it has been categorically held that where the accused has remained in custody for a considerable period and the trial has not even commenced, or is not likely to conclude in the near future, therefore, continued incarceration would amount to punishment without trial. In such circumstances, further detention pending trial is not necessary and the accused is entitled to be released on bail.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the



case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

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

11. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10.04.2026

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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