



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-65543-2025

Date of decision: 27.11.2025

AMIT KUMAR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Bharat Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 84 dated 26.05.2025, registered under Section(s) 22 and 27-61-85 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Nangal, Rupnagar.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the case of the petitioner would be at par with co-accused Shubham Thakur to whom concession of regular bail has been granted by this Court vide order dated 20.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-45633 of 2025. He further contends that the Additional Sessions Judge, Rupnagar rejected the bail application of the petitioner only on a premise that the recovered quantity is commercial whereas the same is non-commercial.

3. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the same and fairly

concedes that the case of the petitioner would be at par with co-accused Shubham Thakur.

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

5. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration that similar placed co-accused Shubham Thakur has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 20.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-45633 of 2025 , I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 27, 2025
Vishal Sharma

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