



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43790-2025

Reserved on: 11th November, 2025Pronounced on: 20th November, 2025

Sandeep Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

This is the third petition for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 367 dated 21.12.2024 registered under Section 22(c) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985 (for short '*NDPS Act*') at Police Station Kosli, District Rewari. The previous two petitions as filed by him have been dismissed as withdrawn on 16.06.2025 and 07.07.2025 respectively.

2. As per the allegations, on 21.12.2024, upon receipt of secret information, the petitioner Sandeep Kumar was apprehended from the area of Bus Stand, village Gugod, and a recovery of 3,000 intoxicating tablets along with cash amounting to ₹1,600 was effected from his conscious possession. He failed to produce any permit or licence for possessing the said intoxicating tablets. He was formally arrested. The investigation now stands completed.



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case and that a false recovery has been planted upon him. He is in custody since 21.12.2024. He has clean antecedents. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, as none out of the 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. Commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from him. His previous two bail petitions have already been dismissed and the present one is a successive petition. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or committing similar offences, if extended the concession of bail. Therefore, it is contended that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have been found in conscious possession of commercial quantity of intoxicating tablets as on 21.12.2024. The investigation stands concluded. Trial has commenced and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. The rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act are attributed in this case. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is well settled proposition of law that while deciding a petition for grant of bail, the Court has to take into consideration the factors that as to whether, there is a



prima facie case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence, the nature and gravity of the accusation, severity of the punishment in the event of conviction, likelihood of the offence being repeated, the danger of the accused absconding or fleeing if released on bail. Taking into consideration all these factors, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

8. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

20th November, 2025
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |