



CRM-M-6868-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-6868-2025

Reserved on: 4th September, 2025Pronounced on: 10th September, 2025

Naman Khanna

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sumit Dua, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 118 dated 29.11.2024 registered under Section 21 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS') (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on) at Police Station Bhargo Camp, District Jalandhar.

2. As per the allegations, on 29.11.2024, a secret information was received to the effect that the petitioner and his brother Ridham Khanna were indulged in supply of contraband and Naman Khanna(petitioner) used to sell it to its customers after receiving the same in his rented accommodation from his brother i.e. co-accused Ridham Khanna. It was also informed that they could be apprehended with substantial quantity of *heroin*, if raided immediately. Believing the secret information to be true, a *ruqa*



was sent to the police station for registration of FIR. A police party headed by SI Mohan Lal reached at the rented accommodation of the petitioner, one white envelop containing 155 grams of heroin, 10 small plastic envelops and one electric weighing scale, were recovered. The petitioner was formally arrested. Subsequently, co-accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has been in custody since 29.11.2024. A false recovery has been planted upon him. The police officials failed to comply with the mandatory provisions of law at the time of investigation. There is no independent evidence to corroborate the prosecution version. Trial will take time to conclude. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have been involved in the business of supplying *heroin* and recovery of 155 grams of *heroin* is alleged to have been effected from him which is of non-commercial quantity. He has been in custody since 29.11.2024. He is stated to be involved in one more case of similar nature and in another case, he had been convicted under Section 22



of NDPS Act. However, his involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to the petitioner. Trial will obviously take time to conclude since the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the period spent by him in custody and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

10th September , 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*