



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

**CRM-M-28910-2025**

**Date of Decision:05.08.2025**

Sanoj

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Manish Bansal, Advocate with  
Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate  
Mr. Shourya Nagpal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Addl. A.G., Haryana

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.118, dated 20.05.2024, registered under Sections 20(b) (ii) (c) and 29 of NDPS Act, Police Station Industrial Area Bhiwani, District Bhiwani.
2. According to the prosecution story, the petitioner was found in conscious possession of 21.440 Kilograms of Ganja, without any permit or licence.
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. The petitioner is in custody since 20.05.2024 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. He next contends that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. 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-M37684-2021, 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 on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

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 pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

05.08.2025

*hitesh*

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