



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

CRM-M-35156-2026

Date of Decision:08.07.2026

Ramandeep Singh @ Kaada

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Japjit Singh Johal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sartaj Singh Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the third petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S, for grant of regular bail to him in case FIR No. 165, dated 05.11.2024, registered under Sections 21 (c), 25 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Special Task Force, District SAS Nagar, Mohali, whereas, final report has been presented under Sections 21,25,29 of NDPS Act.

2. According to the prosecution story, the petitioner was found in conscious possession of 260 grams of heroin, without any permit or licence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The quantity of contraband recovered from the petitioner is marginally above the 'commercial quantity'. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that final report under Section 193 of B.N.S.S has already been presented against the petitioner. The prosecution has placed reliance on 20 witnesses, but no witness has been examined so far.



He was arrested in the present case on 05.11.2024 and is in custody since then. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgments in **(i) CRM-M-37684-2021, Balwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab, decided on 14.02.2022; (ii) CRM-M-8212-2022, Tajinder Singh vs. State of Punjab, decided on 03.03.2022 and (iii) CRM-M-35186-2016, Manjit Kaur @ Jeeto vs. State of Punjab, decided on 01.12.2016.**

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

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

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, custody period of the petitioner and also the fact that the quantity of alleged contraband is marginally above the 'commercial quantity', but without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

08.07.2026
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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