

2025:PHHC:123324



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

213

**CRM-M-49140-2025
Date of decision: 09.09.2025**

VIKRAM ALIAS KALU

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Darpan Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana
for the respondent-State.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 39 dated 09.02.2025 registered under Section 22-C of the NDSP Act (Section 29 of the NDPS was added later on) at Police Station Civil Lines Kaithal, District Kaithal.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 08.02.2025, ASI Rajesh Kumar, while on patrolling duty along with other police officials near the railway crossing at Bus Stand, Kaithal, received a secret information that Vikram @ Kalu, son of Daya Ram (petitioner-accused), and Sanjeev, son of Ram Kumar, were indulging in the sale of narcotic tablets near Bus Stand, Kaithal, and Hanuman Vatika, Kaithal, and that they would

**CRM-M-49140-2025**

-2-

shortly arrive at Randhir Colony, Karnal Road, Kaithal for the purpose of selling such narcotic tablets to drug addicts. Upon receipt of the said information, a notice under Section 42 of the NDPS Act was duly prepared and dispatched to Police Station Civil Lines, Kaithal. After about 10–15 minutes, two persons were seen approaching on a motorcycle from the side of Sugar Mill, Kaithal, and were apprehended. On interrogation, the driver disclosed his name as Sanjeev, son of Ram Kumar, resident of Kapil Nagar, Kaithal, while the pillion rider disclosed his name as Vikram @ Kalu, son of Daya Ram, resident of Kapil Nagar, Kaithal. The latter was found carrying a polythene bag in his hand. On search of the said bag, 90 strips of Tramadol Hydrochloride Sustained Release Tablets I.P. 100 mg (Trohma-100 SR) were recovered, each strip containing 10 tablets, totalling 900 tablets and weighing 278.1 grams. The recovered tablets were found to be narcotic in nature and banned under law. Accordingly, it was alleged that Vikram @ Kalu and Sanjeev, by being in possession of 900 narcotic tablets, had committed an offence punishable under Section 22(c) of the NDPS Act, whereupon a ruqa was sent to the Police Station and formal FIR was registered.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner does not suffer from any criminal antecedents and he has been in custody since 09.02.2025. There are total 19 witnesses but no witness has been examined so far. He contends that in the present case, there are serious lapses on the part of the respondents w.r.t to compliance of mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act. He further submits that the

**CRM-M-49140-2025**

-3-

petitioner was the pillion rider on the motorcycle which such motorcycle is not registered in the name of the petitioner at all.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that a commercial quantity of Tramadol tablets were recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. She, however, does not dispute the fact that the petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents and that the trial has not commenced so far. It is also not disputed that co-accused Robin Gupta and Ram Mehar have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 23.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-17984-2025 and CRM-M-23081-2025.

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

6. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the age of the petitioner and his clean antecedents, the stage of the trial as well as bearing in mind the concession of bail having been extended to the similarly placed co-accused persons, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. 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.

8. 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-49140-2025

-4-

9. 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.

SEPTEMBER 09, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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