



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

296

**CRM-M-17064-2025
Date of decision: 25.08.2025**

AJAY SHARMA ALIAS GORAPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No. 426 dated 24.09.2024 under Sections 21, 22 and 29 of the ND&PS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused on the strength of recovery of one strip of Etizolam containing 10 tablets. He contends that as per the case of prosecution, four persons were sitting in the car and one strip containing 10 tablets each was recovered from each of the persons so sitting while 05th strip was recovered from the ground. It is submitted that since the respondents have effected recovery of one specific strip from the petitioner,

**CRM-M-17064-2025**

-2-

the aspect of joint possession would become circumspect. He submits that the recovery would thus be non-commercial against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for last 11 months and out of the 15 witnesses, 02 witnesses have been examined while 06 witnesses have been given up. He submits that the main witnesses are yet to be examined by the respondents.

3. Counsel for the respondent-State, however, contends that petitioner has criminal antecedents and that he was involved in three cases of Excise Act and three other cases under the IPC as well as one case of NDPS Act. He, however, does not dispute the factual matrix noticed above and the recovery of individual strips of 10 tablets each.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

5. Taking note of the contentions noticed above, the stage of the trial as well as the age of the petitioner, I am of the opinion that further incarceration of the petitioner in a case where the trial is not likely to conclude soon would not be warranted. I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

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

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.



CRM-M-17064-2025

-3-

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

AUGUST 25, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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