



CRM-M-30552-2025

-1-

(224)

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

CRM-M-30552-2025

Date of Decision: 07.08.2025

RAJ KUMAR @ RAJU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.092 dated 08.07.2023 registered under Section 22(C) of NDPS Act at Police Station Kabarwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. The brief facts of the case are that petitioner-Raj Kumar @ Raju and Ravinder Singh @ Ravi came to be apprehended with 30 tablets of Vyado MD-0.5 and 20 tablets of Apiz-0.5 which contained the salt Etizolam.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The recovery has been planted upon him. There is a violation of the mandatory provisions of the Act regarding search and seizure. As the petitioner is in custody since 08.07.2023 but 02 of the 23 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon

**CRM-M-30552-2025****-2-**

and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the petitioner. He is an accused in two other cases arising out of FIR No.220/2019 U/s 21 NDPS Act, P.S. Kabarwala and FIR No.67/2022 U/s 22-b of NDPS Act, P.S. Kabarwala. Therefore, no satisfaction under Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be arrived at that the petitioner has not committed an offence and is not likely to commit in future. Hence, he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. As per the case of the prosecution, commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the petitioner and his co-accused. He is an accused in two other cases of a similar nature. Therefore, the satisfaction that is to be recorded under Section 37 of the NDPS Act that the petitioner has not committed the offence and is not likely to commit one in future cannot be recorded.

7. In view of the above, I find no merits in the present petition. Therefore, the same stands dismissed.

8. However, the Trial Court is directed to conclude the Trial as expeditiously as possible but in any case not later than six months from the next date fixed before it.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

07.08.2025

JITESH

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