



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

220

CRM-M-53954-2025
Date of decision: 29.09.2025

RAMAN KUMAR ALIAS RINKU

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant third petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 96 dated 24.10.2024 registered under Section 21 of the NDPS Act of 1985 (Section 29 of the NDPS Act was added later on) at Police Station PAU, Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that co-accused Deepak Sharma and Kuldeep Singh were apprehended by the Police on 24.10.2024 and 8600 intoxicant tablets were recovered from their conscious possession. During the course of investigation, on the disclosure statement of co-accused Kuldeep Singh, 900 ampoules make Pentazocine Lactate, 7200 capsules make Acetaminophen Tramadol and 750 ampoules

make Tramadol Hydrochloride were recovered. The petitioner has been nominated as an accused under section 29 NDPS Act on 30-10-2024. It has been specifically alleged that the petitioner used to sell narcotics to the co-accused and used to receive money from them in his bank Account.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the recovery of contraband has been effected from co-accused Deepak Sharma and Kuldeep Singh who were jointly found in possession of 2000 intoxicant tablets make Tramadol Prolonged Release IP as well as 6600 other intoxicant tablets on 24.10.2024. During the disclosure, certain additional quantity was also recovered from the said accused. He contends that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner. It is submitted that similarly placed co-accused Munawar Ali @ Manawar Ali @ Manavvar Ali has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 16.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-50864-2025.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects.

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 that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner and the fact that co-accused Munawar Ali @ Manawar Ali @ Manavvar Ali has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 16.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-50864-2025, 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.

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 29, 2025

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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