



234

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

CRM-M-4359-2024**Date of Decision:22.04.2025**

Ravinder Kumar alias Ravi

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.376 dated 01.07.2023 registered under Sections 21/27-A and 29-61-85 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Ambala Cantt. District Ambala Cantt.

2. As per case of the prosecution, the recovery of 268 grams of heroin, which is marginally above commercial quantity, has been recovered from the petitioner on the basis of the secret information by the police.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case and no recovery was effected from him. He further contends that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal activity. The petitioner is in custody since 01.07.2023 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. Trial is likely to take long time. No useful purpose will be served by further detention of the petitioner in custody. Thus, it is prayed that he may be released on regular bail. 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 counsel for the State vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, he fairly conceded the fact that petitioner is not involved in any other criminal activity.

5. 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.

6. Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

22.04.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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