



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

112

1) **CRM-M-46104-2025**
Decided on : 05.06.2026

Gurpal Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

2) **CRM-M-58421-2025**

Shailendra Singh @ Sallu . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

3) **CRM-M-66268-2025**

Gurdev Singh @ Gebi . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Sarika Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-46104-2025).

Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-58421-2025).

Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rajdeep Singh Gill, Advocate and
Ms. Simran Makkar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-66268-2025).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-46104-2025, CRM-M-58421-2025 and CRM-M-66268-2025, as all the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-46104-2025.

2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of



BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FI R No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurpal Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-46104-2025)	56	09.04.2025	S. 21C, 25 of NDPS Act, 1985 and S. 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (added offence under S. 27A of NDPS Act, vide GD No.13, dated 10.04.2025, and added offence under S. 29 of NDPS Act, vide GD No.39, dated 12.04.2025)	Lopoke	Amritsar
Shailendra Singh @ Sallu (petitioner in CRM-M-58421-2025)	56	09.04.2025	S. 21©, 25, 27-A, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 and S. 25 of Arms Act, 1959	Lopoke	Amritsar
Gurdev Singh @ Gebi (petitioner in CRM-M-66268-2025)	56	09.04.2025	S. 21-C, 25, 27-A, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 and S. 25 of Arms Act, 1959, and S. 341(2) of BNSS, 2023	Lopoke	Amritsar

3. As per the case of the prosecution, on 09.04.2025, while the police party was on patrol duty and present near the bridge situated on the main road behind Village Kehali, one motorcycle was noticed approaching from the side of the village. Upon noticing the police party, the rider allegedly got perplexed and attempted to take a U-turn. However, he was apprehended and, upon inquiry, disclosed his identity as Ranjit Singh @ Rana. On search, 528 grams of heroin and one Glock 9 mm pistol along with two magazines were recovered from a plastic bag being carried by him.

During investigation, disclosure statement of accused Ranjit Singh @ Rana was recorded, wherein he named **Shailendra Singh @ Sallu (petitioner in CRM-M-58421-2025)** and **Gurdev Singh @ Gebi (petitioner in CRM-M-66268-2025)**, alleging that he used to deliver drug money to them and purchase heroin in return.

Thereafter, accused/petitioners Shailendra Singh @ Sallu and Gurdev Singh @ Gebi were arrested while travelling together in a Swift car



(without registration number). Though no narcotic substance was recovered from their possession, an amount of Rs.33.00 lakhs was allegedly recovered from the vehicle.

Subsequently, on the basis of their disclosure statements and the aforesaid recovery, another accused, namely, **Gurpal Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-46104-2025)**, was arrested on 13.04.2025. At the time of his arrest, recovery of Rs.91.00 lakhs (Indian currency), 3400 Dirhams and 5000 US Dollars was allegedly effected from a Honda City car in his possession.

4. Learned Senior counsel argues that against none of the accused earlier any such offence punishable under the NDPS Act, has ever registered, except of one case against accused – **Gurdev Singh @ Gebi (petitioner in CRM-M-66268-2025)**, in which 20 grams of heroin was recovered. However, in that case, accused/petitioner – Gurdev Singh @ Gebi, is already on bail.

Further argues that as of now, out of total cited 14 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined, that too partially, and next date fixed before the trial Court is 13.07.2026.

It is also argued that the alleged recoveries are matters of evidence and their nexus with the alleged narcotic trade remains to be established during trial. It is contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated and that the prosecution version is liable to be tested during the course of evidence.

Thus, in the given facts & circumstances of the case, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

5. At this stage, learned State counsel has filed three custody certificates dated 04.06.2026 in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.



Copies thereof have been handed over to the counsel for the petitioners.

6. Learned State counsel though vehemently opposes the prayer for bail, however, he is not in a position to dispute the factual position that except of one case against the accused/petitioner – Gurdev Singh @ Gebi, no other case under the NDPS Act, has been found to be registered against the all of them.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

8. Taking into consideration that accused/petitioners – **Shailendra Singh @ Sallu** (in CRM-M-58421-2025) and **Gurdev Singh @ Gebi** (in CRM-M-66268-2025) have remained in custody for about 01 year, 01 month and 20 days and that an amount of Rs.33.00 lakhs was allegedly recovered from their joint possession while they were travelling together in a car, this Court is of the view that the nexus of the recovered amount with the alleged drug trafficking activities is yet to be established by the prosecution during trial.

It is also not disputed that, except for one other case against **Gurdev Singh @ Gebi**, neither of the aforesaid petitioners as involved in any other case under the NDPS Act. Furthermore, out of 14 cited prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined and that too partially. Thus, conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the prayer for regular bail made by Shailendra Singh @ Sallu and Gurdev Singh @ Gebi deserves to be accepted.

Consequently, prayer made in the petitions, i.e. CRM-M-58421-2025 & CRM-M-66268-2025 are **allowed**. Petitioners – **Shailendra Singh**



@ **Sallu** and **Gurdev Singh @ Gebi** are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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 petitioners – **Shailendra Singh @ Sallu** and **Gurdev Singh @ Gebi** 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 clarified that in case the petitioners are found indulging in any similar criminal activity during the period of bail or misuse the concession granted to them in any manner, it shall be open to the prosecution to seek cancellation of bail in accordance with law.

12. So far as petitioner – **Gurpal Singh** (in CRM-M-46104-2025) is concerned, it is not disputed that recovery of Rs.91.00 lakhs (Indian currency), 3400 Dirhams (UAE currency) and 5000 US Dollars was allegedly effected from his possession.

Record of the case file further reveals that present case originated from recovery of 528 grams of heroin from the possession of co-accused **Ranjit Singh @ Rana**, which falls within the category of commercial quantity. During investigation, petitioner – **Gurpal Singh** came to be nominated on allegations of involvement in drug trafficking and handling of drug proceeds.

Having regard to the magnitude of the alleged recovery effected



from his possession and in the absence of any satisfactory explanation regarding the source of the aforesaid cash amount at this stage, this Court does not find any ground to extend the concession of regular bail to petitioner – Gurpal Singh.

Consequently, **CRM-M-46104-2025**, *qua* petitioner – **Gurpal Singh, is dismissed.**

13. **With aforesaid observations, all the instant petitions stand disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

June 05, 2026

J.Ram

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